

THE
LONDON REVIEW.

JULY, 1860.

ART. I.—*On the Origin of Species.* By CHARLES DARWIN.

THAT high authority, Augustine Caxton, has told us of a learned man who prevented his brain from working by heaping too many books upon his head. This seems to have been the case with the author of this highly interesting but confused and fallacious book. When we remember that Mr. Darwin's single volume condenses the observation and reading of a whole life, and briefly epitomizes a huge unmanageable mass of facts, we do not wonder that such profuse and complicated evidence should have somewhat interfered with the clearness of the final verdict. Perhaps this result is less the fault of the individual writer, than a necessary consequence of his attempt to generalize prematurely. Whenever scientific observation accumulates facts largely in excess of our knowledge of the laws that regulate them, there will always be a strong temptation to theorize; and the theories thus prematurely formed will have moreover a strong advantage of position, a *natural advantage*, as we might say to Mr. Darwin, which tends to establish and perpetuate them; this, namely, that being founded on our imperfect knowledge, we cannot bring positive knowledge to disprove them. But this is a position which scientific men are generally very cautious in assuming. It is held to be speculation, not science, to put forward a theory which we cannot prove, and throw on our opponents the onus of disproof. Ancient philosophy founded its wildest speculations on the maxim that where denial is impossi-

ble, assertion is safe; but it has been the rejection of this maxim which has led modern science to its clear and accurate deductions; and we think it derogatory to Mr. Darwin's scientific reputation that he should have stepped back from the modern to the ancient standing-ground; and, in support of a theory which at best must be pronounced woefully premature, should have appealed to our ignorance rather than to our knowledge. Do we say that the variation of species appears to be limited? We are not acquainted with the laws of variation. Do we say that all we know of correlation would not serve his purpose? Of correlation we are profoundly ignorant. Do we say that geology is against him? Geology is confessedly imperfect. Do we say that geographical distribution is against him? We have little knowledge of the means of distribution. In short, the chief part of his evidence amounts to this: Of all that we are ignorant I claim the possible results, even of 'principles which, though not proved to be true, can be shown to be in some degree probable.' (Page 446.) This is Mr. Darwin's position, and we think it unworthy of his reputation. Let us add that he maintains it with all the candour of a true-hearted man of science. He never evades an objection nor shirks a difficulty, even when he is obliged to confess it beyond his solution. He gives us all sides of a question, even when he only argues on one. He states all manner of facts, even while he appropriates only those that suit his purpose. No one but an honest and learned man, who could and would give to others the full evidence that had satisfied himself, would have written a book like this. Its honesty is so apparent, that, in the contradictions that again and again occur in its pages, we see nothing more than the partial forgetfulness and confusion of a writer lost in the labyrinth of his own multiplied facts. On this ground, we think, Mr. Darwin gains rather than loses by the necessity which he so often deplures, of having to curtail his evidence; for we are more disposed to trust his candour than his reasoning, and therefore, when he says he has ample ground for his conclusions, we are inclined to believe him, whereas, if we saw his evidence, we might possibly deem it inconclusive.

Hitherto we have said nothing of the aim of this book. It is an attempt to prove that all existing plants and animals have not been created in their present sharply-defined specific forms, but have been gradually changed in the course of millions of millions of generations, under the operation of a law of unlimited variation. 'Probably all the organic beings that have ever lived on this earth have descended from some one primordial form, into which life was first breathed by the Creator.'

(Page 484.) We need scarcely say that this is rather a rude shock to our received belief. Geologists have tortured the first chapter of Genesis to suit their theories of the inorganic world, and now we have to put that unfortunate chapter again on the rack to make it confess still more. Certainly there is an immense distance between words and their ordinary meaning, if we are to understand from that chapter that God did *not* make great whales, and winged fowl, and beasts of the earth ; but, rather, one primordial form, considerably lower than the lowest mollusc.

Scientific men always loudly protest against any appeal to Scripture on questions of science, and we do not mean to interfere with their creed. We only ask for received religious belief the same sort of respect that is paid to received scientific belief, namely, the respect due to established position. It has an *à priori* claim on our reverence, that is all ; a claim to be honoured as truth, until beyond all question it can be proved to be error. And he who brings against religion a crude theory, unsound arguments, and carefully selected facts, stands fairly exposed to the charge of having unwarrantably trifled with things accounted sacred. Let him collect facts and study laws to his heart's content. It is not facts and laws that imperil religion, but the theories that run so far ahead of them. No one will quarrel with Mr. Darwin's facts and laws,—we only wish he had given us more of them,—but he will have to bear reproach from every quarter for the crude theory he has built on them, and the fallacious reasoning by which he has supported it.

Of the interest of the book we cannot speak too strongly. Apart from its theory, it gives us a summary of the laws and relations that connect the whole organic and inorganic world ; and we greatly regret that so much observation and reflection, so much learning and candour, should have been warped to the support of a mere speculation, an unproved and mischievous theory. If Mr. Darwin would but re-write it, weed out its fallacies, and graft in more facts, it would be the most popular book of modern science ; and it would, moreover, better serve his purpose, if, as we do not doubt, that purpose be the advancement of truth. For we think he would himself admit that, even if his theory be true, it is immature, and by no means clearly proved. If so, the want of proof is against it, and its immaturity will throw back its truth for years. Therefore we think he would have better served his own cause by sending into the world a mass of well-arranged facts, and leaving them to influence silently the progress of opinion. Still more, if his theory

be not true, would the cause of truth have been better aided by its suppression; for it is exceedingly plausible, and will mislead many. There is no error in argument more difficult to expose and hold up to the light, than an honest man's 'begging the question.' Very often the fallacy arises from his own deep conviction on the subject, which makes him overlook the necessity of proof: hence he is exceedingly apt to take for granted the very point at issue; and his reader, following him, acquiesces in the assumption, not perceiving that in half a sentence there may lie a fallacy in reasoning which shall vitiate the conclusions of a whole volume.

We shall give a summary of Mr. Darwin's argument, as much as possible in his own words, before we make any comment. It is contained in the first five chapters, and may be summed up in the following propositions:—

1. Established species vary. Chapters i. and ii.
 2. Varieties are incipient new species. Chapters ii. and v.
 3. But the world is too full to allow room for unlimited new species: therefore, in the struggle for existence, the more favoured forms will conquer, and the less favoured will gradually die out. Chapter iii.
 4. The natural advantage of some forms over others, by which the best fitted are 'selected' to fill the world, is natural selection, and natural selection tends toward divergence. Chapter iv.
- To go more into detail. The plants and animals that have come under man's influence have varied enormously. The descent of widely different breeds of dogs, cattle, horses, fowls, and pigeons, from a common stock, is an acknowledged fact; and so also is the mode by which such breeds are produced at man's pleasure. The cattle-breeder and the horticulturist take advantage of nature's slight varieties, and propagate from the variety, knowing that some of the offspring will probably resemble the parent. These aberrant forms are again selected to carry on the process, which is repeated through several generations, until a distinct breed is fairly established.

Species in a state of nature have also wide and permanent variations. 'The most experienced naturalist would be surprised at the number of the cases of variability, even in important parts of structure, which he could collect on good authority during a course of years.' (Page 45.) 'Compare the several floras of Great Britain, France, or the United States, drawn up by different botanists, and see what a surprising number of forms have been ranked by one botanist as good species, and by another as mere varieties. Mr. H. C. Watson has marked for me 182 British plants, which are generally considered as varieties,

but which have all been ranked by botanists as species.' (Page 48.) 'Certainly no clear line of demarcation has as yet been drawn between species and sub-species, or, again, between sub-species and well-marked varieties, or between lesser varieties and individual differences. These differences blend into each other in an insensible series; and a series impresses the mind with the idea of an actual passage.' (Page 51.) It is true we cannot detect the passage of one form into another; for nature is unaccountably slow in her operations. Instead, therefore, of proving the fact, the utmost we can do is to point out the many small analogies that subsist between varieties and species, and which seem to render their identity probable, though it does not admit of proof. In many cases, that which is true of one is also true of the other: thus, if we take any particular country we shall find, that in genera which contain many species, there will be a large proportion of species that vary, and these species will have more than the average number of varieties. This is what we should expect, if varieties were incipient species; for 'wherever the manufactory of species has been active, we ought generally to find it still in action.' (Page 56.) Again, in large genera (in which, be it remembered, there are most varieties) the amount of difference between the species is often exceedingly small; that is to say, 'many of the species already manufactured, still to a certain extent resemble varieties.' (Page 57.) Again, varieties group themselves around species, as species group themselves in sections or sub-genera. Again, varieties have restricted ranges, which also seems to be true of 'those species which are very closely allied to other species, and in so far resemble varieties.' (Page 58.) 'We can clearly understand all these analogies, if species have once existed as varieties, and have thus originated: whereas, these analogies are utterly inexplicable if each species has been independently created.' (Page 59.)

Of the laws that influence these variations our ignorance is profound. 'Not in one case out of a hundred can we pretend to assign a reason why this or that part differs, more or less, from the same part in the parents.' (Page 167.) One cause of variation may be found in the outward conditions of life, which directly or indirectly affect the functions of the parents and more remote ancestors. Another exists, perhaps, in use and disuse, which strengthens certain parts, and diminishes others. Another, in the inherent facility with which many plants and animals suit themselves to changes of climate. Another, in that mysterious affinity between different parts of an animal, (technically termed 'correlation of growth,') by virtue of which one

part becomes modified by the variation of another. But whatever be the causes of variety, it is the steady accumulation of such differences that gives rise to the more important modifications of structure in all the innumerable beings on the face of the earth. (Page 170.)

Now let us observe how varieties and species act on each other. (Chap. iii.) The lavish beneficence of the Creator's hand has given to natural increase a great excess over natural decay and death. 'Every organic being increases at so high a rate, that if not destroyed, the earth would soon be covered by the progeny of a single pair.' (Page 64.) This prodigious excess is kept in continual check by limitation of food, by change of climate or atmosphere,—wet, drought, frost, and blight; by herbaceous quadrupeds, by insects, by birds and beasts of prey, &c. Thus, all organic beings are exposed to severe competition; and the 'struggle for existence will almost invariably be most severe between the individuals of the same species; for they frequent the same districts, require the same food, and are exposed to the same dangers. In the case of varieties of the same species, the struggle will generally be almost equally severe.' (Page 75.) And 'as species of the same genus have usually, though by no means invariably, some similarity in habits and constitution, and always in structure, the struggle will generally be more severe between species of the same genera, when they come into competition with each other, than between species of distinct genera.' (Page 76.) 'Owing to this struggle for life, any variation, however slight, if it be in any degree profitable to an individual of any species, will tend to the preservation of that individual, and will generally be inherited by its offspring. The offspring, also, will thus have a better chance of surviving.....I have called this principle, by which each slight variation, if useful, is preserved, by the term of "natural selection." (Page 61.) But as it appears that the struggle is most severe between nearly allied varieties or species, it follows that diversity has in itself an advantage. 'The more diversified the descendants from any one species become, by so much will they be better enabled to seize on diversified places in the polity of nature.' (Page 112.) But if diversity is, so to speak, always at a premium, the process carried through all time must result in unlimited divergence.

We have given this long summary of Mr. Darwin's first five chapters because his theory rests on these alone. If their facts are inconclusive, or their arguments unsound, the theory falls to the ground. But before we go into details, we must observe that it is not enough to prove that there is great variety in

existing forms, and certain unknown laws of variation, and many analogies between varieties and species: we frankly admit it all; but the real question at issue is this,—Does variety oscillate and tend to revert, or does it continually tend to diverge? Has the Creator made organic forms essentially persistent, though endowed with a limited capacity for variation, or has He made them essentially variable, destined to pass slowly but surely one into the other? If we are right, all the facts and laws of variation ought to show an excess of oscillation and reversion over divergence. If Mr. Darwin is right, those facts and laws ought to show an excess of divergence over oscillation and reversion.

Now we find under man's immediate influence certain forms which we call 'our domestic species,' and which, amidst much external variation, have remained essentially the same for three or four thousand years. Our cat and dog are the cat and dog of ancient Egypt, just as the cattle of ancient Egypt are the present wild cattle of the South American plains. Nevertheless, we can induce in these forms an enormous amount of variation, apparently far greater than many of the differences which subsist between so-called species. Hence arises the suspicion, that between our artificial varieties, or 'breeds,' and true species, there is no real difference. Yet there are three points of strong contrast between them. 1st. The changes which man can produce in plants and animals may be very rapidly effected, and, apart from man's agency, may be nearly as rapidly destroyed; but the rough material, so to speak, the original domestic stock, has been persistent for thousands of years. 2nd. While man can only keep his forms persistent by strict interbreeding, nature keeps her forms persistent in spite of the freest intercrossing. 3rd. Man's greatest care and effort cannot subdue in his artificial breeds a tendency to revert to the original stock; but this stock is nature's persistent form, it reverts no further.

With regard to the first point, Mr. Darwin admits that 'it is certain that several of our eminent breeders have, even within a single lifetime, modified, to a large extent, some breeds of cattle and sheep.' 'That most skilful breeder, Sir John Sebright, used to say, with respect to pigeons, that he would produce any given feather in three years, but it would take him six years to obtain head and beak.' (Page 31.) 'We see an astonishing improvement in many florists' flowers, when the flowers of the present day are compared with drawings made only twenty or thirty years ago.' (Page 32.) But, on the other hand, nature's changes are so unfortunately slow, that no theorizer has yet been able to catch her in the fact.

With regard to the second point, it appears that the amount of variation which man can accumulate by careful interbreeding is kept in check by an opposing principle: *interbreeding carried to an extreme, produces deterioration*. Hence the advantage of introducing new blood into a farm stock, instead of continuing to breed in and in. But this introduction must be carefully guarded; for if the new animals be not of the same breed, or some closely allied sub-breed, the stamina imparted by the new blood will be more than counterbalanced by the mongrel character stamped upon the offspring; and individual vigour will be bought by impurity of race. This fact speaks plainly of reversion rather than of divergence. Man's utmost efforts to accumulate variety in one direction, are met by deterioration and weakness; and when, to counteract this, he introduces new blood, that introduction tends to interfere with his accumulated amount of variation. Among horticulturists, certain varieties of fruit are not expected to exist for ever, still less to diverge more and more: they die out in spite of our utmost endeavours to preserve our favourites, and we have to cultivate and select new varieties to supply their place. It would seem that though nature yields to man, and becomes plastic under his hand up to a certain point, beyond that point he can weaken and destroy, but cannot continue to mould her to his purpose.

Thirdly. Even amidst the most careful interbreeding, there is a perpetual tendency to revert to the original stock: but this is not all,—the tendency is *increased* when distinct breeds are crossed. The characters of the original rock pigeon will occasionally appear among our artificial tame breeds; but 'when two birds belonging to two distinct breeds are crossed, neither of which has any of the above-specified marks, the mongrel offspring are very apt suddenly to acquire these characters.' (Page 25.) This tendency to revert to a lost character, 'for all that we can see to the contrary, may be transmitted undiminished for an indefinite number of generations.' (Page 26.)

Now let us sum up all these facts. Man can force nature into a certain amount of divergence; but all that he can do, he can do quickly,—in a few years, a life-time; and it does not appear that he can go beyond a certain point, or that time would help him to do more; all that he can do, he does by most systematic care in the adjustment of two opposite principles, anxiously watching lest continual interbreeding should weaken individual vigour, or occasional intercrossing interfere with purity of race. Yet, in spite of his endeavours to bend her to divergence, nature invariably manifests a tendency to reversion; a tendency which she keeps undiminished for an 'indefinite number of genera-

tions,' and, whenever man strengthens her by new blood, manifests most strongly. And not only he cannot destroy this persistency, but he cannot borrow it for the lasting establishment of his artificial breeds. He has never yet succeeded in producing races so distinct that they refuse to mingle and to produce fertile offspring; but without this barrier against free intercrossing, it is plain that the very existence of artificial breeds must depend on artificial care. If we were to turn out our Durhams and Alderneys on the South American plains, every trace of the separate breeds would soon pass away, but the persistent element would remain, and the cattle would be our domestic species still. It appears, then, that just so far as man drags nature from her persistency, just so far she deprives him of its benefit, and so works out her revenge. She reclaims stragglers, she weakens or degenerates those she cannot reclaim; or when domestic animals escape from his yoke, she completely upsets his work, not building new variety upon it, but restoring it to its old persistent form.

So much for man's agency. But when we leave the sphere over which he has any control, the rapid changes which he accomplishes, and the divergence he produces, altogether disappear. We see no analogous facts in Nature's kingdom; nay, their absence is so notorious, that Mr. Darwin, in support of his theory, calls on us to exercise the Christian grace of faith in that which we do not see. He tells us in one page that nature is a thousand times more powerful than man; that she can produce mammals from reptiles, from fishes, from crustaceans, from 'one primordial form;' and, in another, that her changes are accomplished with such 'extreme slowness,' that no observer has ever yet detected the passage of one closely allied species into another. But this is an effect of time which must not pass unquestioned. Why should change be so much less rapid when nature is left undisturbed? If she requires more time for her operations, it must be because she is more persistent, more hard to change, than when she is forced to yield to man. Yet, mark the conclusion:—if her persistency baffles man in his attempt to force her occasional variety into extreme divergence, how much more will it control and guard that variety from excess when she is left to herself! It is one thing to say that nature produces varieties *rarely*, by rare combinations of circumstances acting on a limited capacity for change; it is another thing to say that she produces varieties *slowly*, by an insensible process going on for ages. We see her doing the first; we see modifications of structure adapted to new outward conditions; and, if the conditions change, we see the modifications disappear. But we do *not*

see any slow and gradual divergence, any trace of small ever-recurring transitions; nor is there the slightest proof that while nature checks man in his rapidly produced varieties, she imitates him slyly by a process that needs thousands of years to effect an equal amount of change. To ask us to believe this, simply because belief, without reason or proof, is necessary to establish Mr. Darwin's theory, is a most unscientific and audacious appeal from our knowledge to our ignorance.

In the second chapter Mr. Darwin should have pointed out the analogies that subsist between the changes accomplished by man, and those which he asserts are accomplished by nature; but as, unfortunately for him, there is no analogy, but wide opposition, between man's visible and nature's invisible process, between man's effort to diverge and nature's power to persist, he shifts his argument, and shows us the many analogies that subsist between natural varieties and species. We doubt if it be worth while to point out the small fallacies that run through many of these analogies; and for this reason, that if they were all strictly correct, they would not be of the least value in the argument. There is no reason why there should not be features of similarity between varieties and species. We believe that the Creator gave to fixed forms a certain elasticity, that they might better adapt themselves to new conditions of existence; and as it has pleased Him to stamp the features of one great family on all organic beings by the evident connexion that subsists between diverse species and genera; as an outlying species will approach another genus, as an erratic genus will approach another family; it was to be expected that varieties also would come under the same law of harmony, the same bond of origin and design, so that an outlying variety of one species might often be found to approach another. Analogies between varieties and species might be, as we say, part of the Creator's harmonious plan, or, as Mr. Darwin says, part of the law of identity between varieties and species: they *might* be either; therefore, to quote them as proof on one side of the question, is against every rule of fair evidence.

The struggle of all animated beings for existence (chap. iii.) is a wide truth which may be partially stated to suit the narrowest purposes of error; indeed, we must accuse Mr. Darwin of being exceedingly apt to *argue* on one point of a question which he may have *stated* in full. This is pre-eminently the case in his chapter on the struggle for existence. He shows us fairly and ably how many causes tend to keep in check the prodigious increase of all organic forms; but when he introduces his theory, he bends his evidence to conclusions which amount

to no more than this: the world is so full, that there is no room for new comers; therefore, if a variety is at a disadvantage, it will become extinct; if it is on precisely the same footing as its parent, it may keep its ground beside it; but if it has any advantage, it will multiply at the expense of its parent. The parent, and not other species, will chiefly suffer, because the struggle is greatest between nearly allied relations, 'that frequent the same districts, require the same food, and are exposed to the same dangers.' We must express our wonder at the extreme carelessness which thus strung together such opposite evidences of a struggle for existence. Certainly common food would be a ground for struggle, but common danger induces no struggle between allied species, but rather between them and the enemies that threaten them with danger. Besides, when we speak of 'the same food,' we must remember the great difference in the term as applied to animals or plants. The 'food' of plants is derived from air, water, and earth, and we doubt if it can possibly be maintained that any one species so exhausts the soil, as to struggle with its own varieties or nearly allied species for existence. We doubt exceedingly if nearly allied species of plants struggle with each other more than with all their neighbours. If we try to locate rarer species in new places, (and we *have* tried,) their struggle for existence is not with nearly allied species, but with coarse grass and hardy weeds with creeping roots. No doubt it is more correct to speak of a struggle between animals that eat the same food; but food is only one element in the warfare; and we must quote Mr. Darwin himself to show how complex are the relations that tend to establish one species and exterminate another:—'In Paraguay neither cattle nor horses nor dogs have ever run wild, though they swarm southward and northward in a feral state; and Azara and Rengger have shown that this is caused by the greater number in Paraguay of a certain fly, which lays its eggs in the navels of these animals when first born. The increase of these flies, numerous as they are, must be habitually checked by some means, probably by birds. Hence, if certain insectivorous birds (whose numbers are probably regulated by hawks or beasts of prey) were to increase in Paraguay, the flies would decrease, then cattle and horses would become feral, and this would certainly greatly alter the vegetation; this again would largely affect the insects; and this the insectivorous birds, and so onwards in ever-increasing circles of complexity.' 'One more instance. I have reason to believe that humble-bees are indispensable to the fertilization of the heartsease; for other bees do not visit this flower. From experiments which I have lately

tried, I have found that the visits of bees are necessary for the fertilization of some kinds of clover; but humble-bees alone visit the red clover, as other bees cannot reach the nectar. Hence I have very little doubt that, if the whole genus of humble-bees became extinct or very rare in England, the heart-ease and red clover would become very rare, or wholly disappear. The number of humble-bees in any district depends, in a great degree, on the number of field-mice, which destroy their combs and nests; and Mr. H. Newman, who has long attended to the habits of humble-bees, believes that "more than two-thirds of them are thus destroyed all over England." Now, the number of mice is largely dependent, as every one knows, on the number of cats; and Mr. Newman says, "Near villages and small towns I have found the nests of humble-bees more numerous than elsewhere, which I attribute to the number of cats that destroy the mice." Hence it is quite credible that the presence of a feline animal in large numbers in a district might determine, through the intervention first of mice and then of bees, the frequency of certain flowers in that district.' (Pp. 72-74.) Thus, after asserting and endeavouring to prove (for it makes a most important link in his chain) that the war for existence is most severe between nearly allied species, Mr. Darwin admits that 'the dependency of one organic being on another lies generally between beings remote in the scale of nature.' (Page 75.) Again: he acknowledges that climate is confessedly 'the most effective of all checks' on increase; yet its destruction does not fall on one variety or species in consequence of the dominance of a nearly allied one: on the contrary, it falls with equal force on the weakly of all species or varieties which inhabit the same district, and are exposed to the same dangers. And there is another effect of climate which Mr. Darwin has entirely overlooked. He represents the struggle as uniform, as if it always tended in one direction, as if a variety that flourished this year must continue to flourish the next and the next, always tending to further divergence. But, in fact, the struggle is not uniform, but intermittent; winter thins away the lavish abundance of summer, and spring gives a new field for a new struggle. This alternation tends to check the dominance of one form over another, by giving an oft-recurring new chance to the weaker party. For instance, if a variety had larger and more tempting seeds than its parent stock, which exposed it to be more visited by summer birds, a severe winter might destroy the birds, and give the variety fairer play another season. All living things are so dependent upon all, as Mr. Darwin has so forcibly told us, that he ought to have been the last man to attempt to limit

the complicated and unknown relations of organic beings to the narrow terms of a syllogism in logic. His proposition is this:—

Major—The world is too full for any new comers.

Minor—And the fight is keenest between near relations.

Ergo—If a variety have the slightest advantage over its parent, it will gradually conquer it, and take its place.

We should rather state it thus:—

Major—The world has room every spring for a new struggle.

Minor—And defeat is to the weak of all species.

Ergo—Destruction ministers to general vigour, not to the prevalence of particular forms.

If this conclusion is correct, Mr. Darwin's argument of extermination falls to the ground. He has asserted that the war of existence is most severe between nearly allied forms, and has utterly failed to substantiate his assertion; but without proof of *this*, he has no foundation for his next statement, that a flourishing variety does, by the fact of its flourishing, tend to exterminate its parent. We have no evidence whatever of this asserted possible superiority of the progeny over the parent; on the contrary, it is a well-known fact that varieties have restricted ranges,—a proof that they are not on the eve of conquering their parent stocks; but if variation were a perpetual and universal process, we should find them in every stage of aggression and conquest, and witness the extermination of vanquished forms.

We arrive at last at 'natural selection,' a term, in our opinion, most unfortunately and improperly chosen; a slippery term used to express much more than its first definition will warrant. The advantage which some forms of life have over others is a certain fact; some perish, some endure, some increase: and though we see something of the complex laws that bind all to each, we cannot calculate the intricate sum, nor in any case predict which shall increase and which shall perish. But we may readily grant that a variation, 'if it be in any degree profitable to an individual of any species, will tend to the preservation of that individual: the offspring also will have a better chance of surviving.' 'This principle,' says Mr. Darwin, 'by which each slight variation, if useful, is preserved, I have called by the term of "natural selection,"'—that is to say, natural selection is nothing more than the natural advantage which some forms have over others, and which tends to their preservation and increase. Is this all Mr. Darwin means? No, it is not; if it were, it would have been far better to have called it 'natural advantage;' but a coined phrase always helps out a halting argument: it is the ready means by which an honest man confuses himself, and a sophist confuses others. Under

the shelter of this term, we must accuse Mr. Darwin of having jumbled together five different things:—1st, the real fact, the natural advantage which some forms have over others; 2nd, the uncertain laws of inheritance; 3rd, the unknown laws of variation and correlation; 4th, the unproved fact of divergence; and, 5th, the hypothesis of development. First, let us look at the passage we have just quoted, (page 61,) and which we have given in full in our summary of Mr. Darwin's argument:—'Owing to this struggle,' &c. The commencement and conclusion of the sentence are connected by false logic, which involves an unproved assumption. 'Owing to the struggle, any variation,—if it be profitable,—will generally be inherited by the offspring.' Now, the inheritance of the offspring is not due to the struggle for life, (a certain fact,) nor to the advantage of some forms over others, (another certain fact,) but it is due to certain laws of inheritance which are not certain, nor uniform, nor by any means as general as this passage would imply, nor in any way connected with the profitableness of the variation. We know that inheritance sometimes continues a variety, and sometimes reverts it; but we do not know why it does either, nor can we predict which it will do, when nature is left undisturbed by man. Yet in this and the parallel passage (page 81) Mr. Darwin entangles the certain fact of natural advantage with the uncertain laws of inheritance. He speaks of natural selection making an occasional habit permanent, (pp. 219, 224,) that is to say, he assumes the certain action of the laws of inheritance, and includes them in his new phrase.

Secondly, he uses the same liberty with the laws of variation and correlation. We must quote somewhat largely to prove this. 'Natural selection will be enabled to act on and modify organic beings, at any age, by the accumulation of variations profitable at that age, and by their inheritance at a corresponding age... Natural selection may modify and adapt the larva of an insect to a score of contingencies wholly different from those which concern the mature insect. These modifications will no doubt affect, through the law of correlation, the structure of the adult;.....so, conversely, modifications in the adult will probably often affect the structure of the larva..... Natural selection will modify the structure of the young in relation to the parent, and of the parent in relation to the young.A structure used only once in an animal's whole life, if of high importance to it, might be modified to any extent by natural selection: for instance, the great jaws possessed by certain insects, used expressly for opening the cocoon,...or the hard tip to the beak of nestling birds, used for breaking the egg.' (Pp. 86, 87.)

Now, does Mr. Darwin mean that the natural advantage which some forms have over others would do all this? Nothing of the sort. He first *assumes* that the laws of variation are unshackled, and will permit unlimited degrees of profitable variety, and then that the laws of correlation will connect this variety with other modifications of structure, and then that the laws of inheritance will make these variations and modifications permanent: he *assumes* all this, and then jumbles together these laws, with the advantages they would confer, under the phrase of 'natural selection.' Separate the advantage from the laws, and natural selection becomes a mere truism. Of course, if some forms *have* advantage, they will *gain* advantage over others; but this would not serve the purpose of a theory. Yet let us only hide under a truism something not certain, perhaps not true; let us only connect important but unknown laws with a known but unimportant fact, and we shall be able to wield both together as a most powerful weapon, lending the certainty of fact to unknown laws, and borrowing the force of laws for an unimportant fact. This is exactly what Mr. Darwin does. We fully believe he does it honestly, confused by his own slippery phrase, but he *does* do it. He assumes the certain action of uncertain laws, the known action of unknown laws; and he confounds these with the fact of natural advantage under the phrase 'natural selection,' making that phrase the representative of an efficient principle, which has all the certainty of fact and the force of law. Natural selection, he says, is abroad in the earth everywhere, 'rejecting that which is bad, and adding up all that is good.' (Page 84.) By natural selection, 'new varieties continually take the place of, and exterminate, their parent forms.' (Page 280.) Natural selection 'results from the struggle for existence, and almost inevitably induces extinction and divergence of character.' (Page 432.) Here, again, we have to assume the possible action of law. *If* the laws of variation, correlation, and inheritance acted thus and thus, *these laws* would do all that Mr. Darwin says natural selection would do. But had he used this phraseology, he would have let in light on his theory; for he is too sound and candid a man of science to base an argument on what these laws might do, while they are avowedly so complex and so little known: but, unconsciously to himself, he has embodied their existence and possible action in a set phrase, until the phrase has hidden from himself and his readers the unproved assumptions that lie beneath it.

Thirdly, under this term, he introduces the principle of divergence in variation. When we are told that Nature can effect more than man, we must be plainly informed what agency

she substitutes for man's careful judgment in the choice of mates. Were a cattle-breeder to match a slightly varying individual with one of the original form, and repeat the process with their offspring, he would soon entirely destroy the peculiarity he had wished to cultivate. It is notorious that, in domestic breeds, divergence is only produced by the careful choice of mates. Man exercises a severe discrimination, and then says, 'Like produces like;' but before nature can say this, like must choose like. A species may produce a well-marked variety; but unless this variety interbreeds, (of course this does not apply to plants,) the tendency to reversion will effectually interfere with its permanent establishment. How does nature escape this difficulty? how does she contrive to mate variety with variety? Be it observed that on her power to do this, on her possession of some contrivance which shall effect this, rests the whole question of divergence in variation; and on the fact of divergence rests Mr. Darwin's whole theory. Nothing short of this will suit his purpose. Varieties are admitted facts, which we have no need to contest; complex laws of variation are admitted, though, being unknown, they cannot fairly be quoted on either side; the struggle for existence is admitted (though not the hasty conclusions drawn from it); the natural advantage of some forms over others is admitted: but all these subsidiary questions only lead us to this final inquiry,—Has the Creator appointed laws and times and circumstances to balance each other, and to produce continual oscillations round fixed forms, or has He bent them all slightly in one direction, that they should minister to a law of divergence old as the earth itself? Mr. Darwin answers the question unhesitatingly. Yes, he says, there is in nature a principle analogous to man's choice of 'like for like,' a principle which stamps divergence on variation. We must give the whole passage, as it constitutes the very key-stone of his argument. 'I believe an analogous principle in nature does apply most efficiently, from the simple circumstance that the more diversified the descendants from any one species become in structure, constitution, and habits, by so much will they be better enabled to seize on many and widely diversified places in the polity of nature, and so be enabled to increase in numbers. We may clearly see this in the case of animals with simple habits. Take the case of a carnivorous quadruped, of which the number that can be supported in any country has long ago arrived at its full average. If its natural powers of increase be allowed to act, it can succeed in increasing only by its varying descendants seizing on places at present occupied by other animals.....The more diversified in habits and structure they became, the more

places they would be enabled to occupy. What applies to one animal will apply throughout all time to all animals; that is, if they vary; for, otherwise, natural selection can do nothing. So will it be with plants. It has been experimentally proved that if a plot of ground be sown with one species of grass, and a similar plot be sown with several distinct genera of grasses, a greater number of plants, and a greater weight of dry herbage, can thus be raised. The same has been found to hold good when first one variety and then several mixed varieties of wheat have been sown on equal spaces of ground. Hence, if any one species of grass were to go on varying, and those varieties were continually selected which differed from each other in at all the same manner as distinct species and genera of grasses differ from each other, a greater number of individual plants of this species of grass, including its modified descendants, would succeed in living on the same piece of ground.....Consequently, I cannot doubt that, in the course of many thousands of generations, the most distinct varieties of any one species of grass would always have the best chance of succeeding and of increasing in numbers, and thus of supplanting the less distinct varieties; and varieties, when rendered very distinct from each other, take the rank of species.' (Pp. 112-114.)

Is this all the evidence Mr. Darwin has to offer in support of divergence in variation? No doubt, it is true in the abstract, that there is more room in the world for diverse than for similar forms; but amidst the profuse complexity of external influences we cannot bend this abstract truth into any practical application; we cannot venture to say that a variety would find room just in proportion as it differed from its parent, when all other surrounding forms are pressing upon it, and many other elements threatening its destruction. It might easily occur, that just so far as it differed from its parent it might come more in contact with other species, or be more susceptible to external elements. Mr. Darwin only argues the question on the ground of diversity: as usual, he *states* many considerations, but *argues* from *one*; yet on this precarious foundation he raises his final conclusion: Because diversity gives an advantage, natural advantage, i.e. natural selection, induces divergence. This is turning a resultant fact into an effective principle with a vengeance: this is arguing in a circle with credit! We might just as well say, that room for variety *makes* variation, as that room for diversity induces divergence. In either case there must be a producing cause, a *law* of variation and divergence, before any advantage could be derived from the fact of having room to vary and diverge. Let us state the case in an extreme form: If there

were more room in the world for dogs than for cats, cats would *therefore* have a tendency to produce dogs. This sounds absurd; but it would not be absurd if we took one little point for granted. *If*, in the lapse of millions of years, cats *could* gradually pass into dogs, the fact of there being more room for dogs would favour that tendency, inasmuch as any variety that more resembled a dog would have an advantage, and would flourish accordingly. But this reasoning assumes that cats *could* pass into dogs; in other words, that there is no limit to nature's variability; the very point on which the whole question rests; the very point which Mr. Darwin is required to prove. Only let us prove, first, that variation has no limit, that it *can* diverge to any amount; and, secondly, that diversity has a small advantage; and the conclusion is most legitimate that, in a long lapse of ages, the advantage given to diversity would induce accumulated divergence: but it would induce it simply by acting on a *law* of unlimited variation. Here again Mr. Darwin is guilty of confusing two ideas in one coined phrase. He entangles the very existence of such a law with the possible advantage which might result from it, and the 'natural selection,' which expresses the advantage, is stretched to include the law.

There is one consideration which may help to show more plainly the absurdity of this reasoning. We do not know the causes that influence vegetable variation, but we do know the chief cause that influences animal variation; this, namely, that variety must mate with variety: and we again ask, What is nature's substitute for man's careful choice of like for like? 'This,' answers Mr. Darwin, 'that the offspring of like and like will find room on the earth: the fact that the plant will flourish will cause it to be produced; still more, the fact that the animal will flourish will cause its parent to choose a mate that will produce it!' Mr. Darwin will object to our imputing to him this heinous flaw in reasoning: it is true, he does not say the one causes the other, but he *does* say that the fact which he so exaggerates, the fact that diversity may be profitable to the offspring, stands in the place of man's selection of mates; and as man *causes* divergence by selection, so, we presume, the profitableness of diversity *causes* it likewise. Throughout this argument, his favourite phrase fairly runs away with him; natural selection has become a powerful living principle which can do anything; natural selection includes extermination, natural selection induces divergence.

Yes, it can do anything, if it be, as we think it is, an old principle under a new name. It scarcely seems fair to impute to an author opinions which he has positively disclaimed; nevertheless,

we cannot fail to notice how many points in Mr. Darwin's statements and reasoning can only be explained by reference to a law of development. The difference between development and natural selection is this: development implies an inherent tendency to work out certain results; and one of its most certain evidences is general regularity of result: natural selection, on the other hand, stripped of the laws so often confused with it, is nothing more than that advantage of present position which gives to favoured individuals the best chance of preservation in the struggle of life. As external conditions vary, this varies; one form has the advantage at one time, another at another; so that, from the very nature of the case, natural selection can never produce any regularity of result. There can be no plan, nor order, nor necessary progress involved in mere suitability to outward conditions. If the elevation of swamps into dry land gradually moulded the reptile into a mammal; the sinking of dry land into swamps would turn the mammal back to a reptile. If certain conditions were favourable to a well-developed variety, others might be favourable to a less-developed one; and this might ascend and that descend in the scale of existence. Mr. Darwin himself admits this irregularity of result. 'I believe,' he says, 'in no fixed law of development, causing all the inhabitants of a country to change simultaneously, or to an equal degree.....The variability of each species is quite independent of that of all others.....Genera and families follow the same general rules, changing more or less quickly, and in a greater or less degree.....Both single species and whole groups of species last for very unequal periods.' (Pp. 314-318.) Yet in spite of this disclaimer, Mr. Darwin perpetually confounds the advantage derived from mere suitability of position with the advantage of improved organization, until his darling natural selection is endowed with the regularity and progression which alone belongs to a law of development.

But before we enter on this subject, we must notice the famous diagram by which he illustrates his theories of divergence and classification. (Chaps. iv. and xiii.) It is a wonderful affair. The surprising harmony between it and his theory strikes us at first with all the force of truth, until we happily remember that a theory could hardly fail to fit a diagram which had been purposely made to fit the theory. The reader may discover its fallacy on its own evidence. Mr. Darwin endeavours to show, (pages 420-422,) that however much species may vary in millions of years, they will be connected genealogically with their predecessors: all the descendants of A will inherit something in common from A, as will all the descendants of I from I; while the de-

scendants of F, who have not diverged at all, will keep their intermediate place between A and I. Yes, they do this in his diagram because he has made them do this: he has purposely kept them clear of each other by not diverging too far. As, however, he has assured us that divergence has an advantage, we will carry it a little farther. We will make the line from A, which ends at m^{10} , diverge a little more to the right, till it just crosses to the right of F^{10} , and we will bring up a left-hand line from I until it crosses to the left of F^{10} , which will give us this remarkable result,—that the family so represented will contain three genera, one slightly resembling its own progenitor F, another more like I, but descended from A, and a third, more like A, but descended from I. If, as Mr. Darwin says, variation and divergence be unlimited, this crossing and entangling of lines would be certain to happen in the lapse of millions of years, and the relation of organic beings to each other would present a scene of inextricable confusion.

We have given this extended notice to Mr. Darwin's first five chapters, because his whole argument is there contained. Henceforward he regards his own conclusions as proved, and uses them as established truths to combat objections and remove difficulties. The present sharply-defined separation of species is against him; (chap. vi.;) the line of demarcation, caused by the sterility of hybrids, is against him; (chap. viii.;) the negative evidence of geology is against him; (chaps. ix. and x.;) the wide separation of allied species by geographical distribution is against him; (chaps. xi. and xii.;) and the mysteries of instinct, if not against him, would, at least, force him back to a lower standing-ground than that which he openly occupies. How does he meet all these difficulties?

In the first place he contends that present species are sharply defined, because they have exterminated their parents and their brethren,—an assertion which we have previously dismissed as altogether unproved. But say that the case were so, we should naturally expect to find some of these exterminated parents and brethren preserved in a fossil state. It is notorious that we do not so find them; upon which Mr. Darwin remarks, that our knowledge of fossils is exceedingly limited, and that we are acquainted with a very small portion of the forms that must once have existed. That is very possible, but the supposition does not meet the difficulty; for whatever fraction of former beings has been preserved, it ought to contain a fair proportion of transitional forms, instead of presenting us with species as sharply defined as those that now exist: many transitional varieties might have perished, but *some* would have been pre-

served, and *some* would have sufficed to prove indisputably that one species does pass into another. In the total absence of any such proof Mr. Darwin is obliged to confess that the negative argument of geology is entirely against him. Nor can his theory at all explain that remarkable fact of past ages,—the simultaneous change of living forms. When he admits that the variability of each species is quite independent of that of all others,—so much so, that some Silurian molluscs are merely specifically different from our own, while others have passed onwards into the highest forms of life,—it is impossible that *his* theory of variation and divergence should account for broad simultaneous changes. The facts of geology bear very hard upon him, and he is continually obliged to remind us of the imperfection of its evidence. This, he says, is the cause of the *apparent* suddenness with which different species and groups of species appear and disappear. Doubtless intermediate beds contained evidence of gradual changes; but they have been exposed to denudation, and have been entirely swept away. Or, if we assume that most of our larger formations have been deposited on a subsiding sea-bed, a period of elevation would leave no remains, but be expressed in our geological record by the interval which separates two distinct formations. Here again we must remind Mr. Darwin that though such causes might account for *occasional* gaps, they are not sufficiently uniform to produce any general uniformity of result. There is no reason why intermediate beds should *always* vanish; nor would periods of elevation *always* fail to leave a record *somewhere*, though not, perhaps, in the immediate neighbourhood of the tract elevated. It is refreshing to hear one of the warmest advocates of the maxim, 'Existing causes always existed,' interpreting geological phenomena by assumptions which have no warrant in the present order of things. If a large tract of land were now to be slowly elevated above the sea, the degradation caused by a line of breakers would be enormous; and we might safely conclude that large new deposits would be formed *somewhere*, and would be *sometimes* preserved. It is refreshing, too, to hear a man of science, a naturalist and geologist, turning round on geology when its evidence is against him, and pointing out how insufficient that evidence yet is, in many respects, for purposes of true generalization. Had an unlucky writer ventured to say as much in defence of some cherished religious belief, he would have been scouted and utterly extinguished.

In the eighth chapter Mr. Darwin endeavours to evade the strong argument drawn from the sterility of hybrids in favour of the essential separation of species. After saying all he can in

self-defence, and almost overwhelming us by his variety of strange and interesting facts, he is forced to admit, first, that 'first crosses between varieties, or forms generally considered such, are very generally, but not quite universally, fertile;' (page 277;) and, secondly, that with regard to so-called species of plants and animals, 'some degree of sterility, both in first crosses and in hybrids, is an extremely general, but not absolutely universal, result;' (page 255;) so much so, however, that 'it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to bring forward one case of the hybrid offspring of two animals *clearly distinct* being themselves perfectly fertile.' (Page 26.) We think Mr. Darwin has yielded all we want in these admissions; yet he sums up his case thus: 'Laying aside the question of fertility and sterility, there seems to be a general and close similarity in the offspring of crossed species and of crossed varieties.....a similarity which harmonizes perfectly with the view that there is no essential distinction between species and varieties.' (Page 276.) This coolness almost strikes us dumb; for what is it we are called to lay aside? The great distinction stamped by nature on the two cases! When artificial varieties are freely intercrossed, the marks of the breed are disturbed, but the mongrel offspring are prone to revert to the original stock. When natural species are forcibly intercrossed, the marks of the species are also disturbed; but so far from there being any tendency towards reversion, nature summarily forbids them to revert.* With regard to the mongrel, she says to man, 'I bring out my laws and my persistency amidst the disturbance of your rules and your variations. I claim back my wanderers; they shall return to me.' But with regard to hybrids, she says, 'You have wantonly broken my laws, and I will not lend my persistency to your monsters. I proclaim them abnormal; they shall neither continue nor increase.' Mr. Darwin finds analogy in marks and stripes, and is blind to the utter want of analogy between the reversion of fertile mongrels and the disturbed structure of barren hybrids.

Finally, Mr. Darwin labours hard to show us by what possible combination of thousands of causes acting through millions of years, his nearly-allied species and genera, all descended from one common ancestry, were separated from each other by the wide distances of our present geographical distribution. Judging from his tone, we should be inclined to think he felt this to be the weakest point of his whole case, nor can we say that he has

* *Vide* Mr Darwin's forced analogy between pigeons and striped hybrids. (Pp. 159-167.)

successfully coped with the difficulty. Yet let every one read these two admirable chapters, not for the argument's sake, but to have some clearer idea of the multiform agencies that have been and are at work in the world, influencing the distribution of organic forms. We will not enter into any minor differences of opinion with Mr. Darwin, but there is one point on which we think he has been aided in error by the narrow words and thoughts of many who stand opposed to him. He is very fond of comparing the broad action of his general laws with little special acts of creation, as if the Creator had personally *worked* in making each separate living form. We think he has been aided in this derogatory view by those who have made it a matter of discussion whether all existing plants and animals sprung from one or many parent stocks, whether the peculiar fauna of islands and mountains were specially created where we find them, &c. It is not by such narrow phraseology that we can measure the might of creative power, and it might well present to an argumentative mind the unpleasant idea of a great Being busily at work in 'innumerable separate acts.' If the Almighty had created only one pair of each animal, and one individual plant, creation would have been the prelude to wide extermination: not a hundredth part would have escaped the instant struggle of all with all. The herbaceous quadrupeds would have eaten up the plants, and the carnivora would have eaten up the animals; nay, the bare uncovered soil would have been without shelter from rain or frost, and waste and destruction would have been the universal law. No, no: let us not think of the Creator as of a skilled artisan, who, however many forms he may make, can make but one at a time. Doubtless by His will and word He sowed vitality broadcast over His beautiful world, making life strong enough to cope at once with all destroying agencies, and then leaving it to the laws ordained to influence it.

Mr. Darwin will not have this interference of the Creator; yet he needs something in its place more uniform in its action than the mere natural advantage which varies with all varying external conditions. He needs something more, and he has found something more. We see it in the beautiful regularity of his diagram, which nothing but an inherent law of order could save from confusion. We hear it in such phrases as 'the process of perfection,' 'improved and perfected forms.' We feel its necessity in the explanation of certain facts, which, by their very regularity, imply a regular law. If we grant that intermediate forms are continually exterminated, the regularity of extermination which leaves species sharply defined is itself a law. If we

grant that the geological record is imperfect, the regularity of causes which always destroy intermediate beds, implies a law. Nay, Mr. Darwin himself admits that the simultaneous change of organic forms can only be accounted for by the operation of 'some special law.' Nor could that onward progress which he calls 'improvement' and 'perfection' ever be attained by mere suitability with outward conditions, unless those conditions were themselves under a law of development:—the inorganic and organic world alike bound onward in the path of progression. So when Mr. Darwin asks for time, only for time, to insure the progress of one 'primordial form' into the highest organizations, he forgets that time is nothing but space for the operation of law. Time is the enemy of all uniform, all stable outward conditions: it brings advance, retreat, elevation, subsidence, destruction, restoration, oscillation of every kind. If ten thousand years gave some advantage to a new form, the next ten thousand might restore it to an old one, and force back the incipient divergence to the original persistency. While all outward conditions oscillate, it is not to be assumed that organic changes can perpetually accumulate in one direction, unless there be some hidden law which acts above and beyond the influence of external conditions. Only under a law of divergence will time accumulate differences; only under a law of development will time insure progress.

Mr. Darwin will not have the Creator's interference; then whence came our present lowest living forms? He tells us whence the highest came,—from one primordial form, by the process of natural selection. But natural selection should have advanced all living beings by this time; for he has told us that higher forms could only establish themselves by some advantage of position, which would have enabled them to exterminate their parents and all intermediate varieties. How comes it, then, that our lower forms are neither advanced nor exterminated? They must have been more lately created or more lately developed. He will not hear of creation; but he is bound to tell us from what sphere these lowest forms can have been advanced, for many of them are already on the verge of organic being. We suspect he will have to retract his 'one primordial form,' to admit that one law of progression rules the organic and inorganic world, and to thrust the Creator still further into the background.

We may well speak openly of development when we turn to the chapter on instinct. Instinct is the link between intelligence and animal life; and if we can prove that it has been originated by natural selection, there can be little doubt that

intelligence is due to the same process. Mr. Darwin is careful to say that he 'has nothing to do with the origin of the primary mental powers;' yet afterwards he allows that instincts may 'be originated,'—that 'occasional strange habits might, if advantageous, give rise, through natural selection, to new instincts.' In short, he considers instincts as in no respect different from mere modifications of animal structure: as one was formed, so was the other, by mere variation and improvement, perpetuated by inheritance. Yet his illustrations drawn from the hive-bee are an outrage on all his previous conclusions. He has uniformly told us that like produces like; but here we see like producing unlike, the fertile producing the sterile. He has told us that only advantageous variety will be perpetuated; but here we see the extreme imperfection of sterility made permanent. He has told us that natural selection induces divergence; but how could natural selection possibly mate the queen and drone best fitted to produce diverging neuters? Even man, all-powerful man, can only do that by disturbing and distorting nature; but here we see nature working out perfect harmony of result, the separate relative instincts of queen, drone, and neuter, being accurately adjusted to each other. It is impossible that anything like natural selection could have accomplished this: not millions of millions of chances could have so balanced the varying conditions on which organic life depends, as to produce this complex result. Such minute and accurate adjustment implies either a creative mandate or an innate principle of development.

We think we have ample cause to say, that though Mr. Darwin disclaims development, his theory tends to it inevitably. He deems it very unsatisfactory to refer the analogies and differences that subsist between all living forms to the Creator's immediate purpose and plan. He asks, Why this, and why that? But however far he may thrust back a Personal Agent, if he recognises Him at all, he has still to face the 'why.' Mr Darwin does not trouble himself with this part of the question; but others, who have gone farther in the same path, have felt the necessity of pausing somewhere. Even the author of the *Vestiges of Creation* put in a disclaimer:—'You must not think,' he said, 'that I have the slightest intention of denying a First Cause; I am but differing on the mode of the Creator's operations. You say, He made these living forms; I say, He made the laws that formed them; and where is the peculiar impiety of my opinion?'

The impiety consists, first, in denying His express word, but still more in denying *Him*, the Personal Interposer, the Personal Judge. This system of law, this determination to look on creation as nothing but law, allows no space for the personal free

agency of man or God. Whether we go back to the first chaos, or on to the highest heaven, we see nothing but law, wonderful, harmonious, but unchangeable law; and the system which denies the interference of the Creator leaves no room for the responsibility of the creature. Mark how these truths or falsehoods hang together. Robert Chambers openly avowed that it was the prevalence of law over the inorganic world which forced him to the conviction that it must be equally prevalent over organic powers. But he did not stop there: he saw that organic powers were closely linked with instincts, and that instinct was nearly allied to intelligence; if laws produced the one, laws might produce the other: in truth, if law be the only power at work in the world, there is no escape from this conclusion. But is not this Materialism? Not so, said the author of the *Vestiges*; not so, implies Mr. Darwin; all corporeal and mental endowments may tend to perfection, and immortality itself be the medium of progress. Ay, but what then? How shall we then divest ourselves of the principle that has animated us, the atmosphere we have breathed? If for ages and ages we have seen and known nothing but law, how can we be sure that there is anything more to be known? We too, poor mortals, are but the offspring of law: will our immortality find any other parentage? Surely if earth have only borne witness to this, we may well doubt if heaven will contain aught beside. No Father, no Saviour, no Sanctifier, nothing but a First, fixed, inexorable Law, with which our developing existence will work in harmony, as the ancients deemed the universe moved to the music of the spheres.

All men do not follow out their own logic; but if we regard this world only as a scene for the manifestation of law, it is difficult to find any line of separation between the lowest result and the First Cause that produced it. The mineral presses closely on the vegetable, the vegetable on the animal, the animal on the instinctive, the instinctive on the intelligent, the intelligent on the moral, the moral on the immortal, the immortal on the Divine. But it has been the great error of men of science to look on creation as a manifestation of but one half of the Deity, forgetting that He is not only the source of law, but of freedom; and that just in proportion as His creatures approach His throne, they too become free. We do not find this principle in some fields of creation: mineral combinations are wholly without it; vegetable organisms do not possess it, though they form an intermediate link between the forces of chemistry and the movements of life. The lowest forms of animal existence are almost destitute of it; but as creatures advance in the scale of being, it begins to dawn upon them, first in freedom of motion, then in freedom

of choice. We may not be able to demonstrate that the bird, which flies here and there at its pleasure, and which chooses its own mate, and tree, and food, is not following a law as blindly as the sulphur and copper which rush into chemical combination, or the lightning that flies across half the earth: we may not be able to prove this; but we believe in the spontaneity we cannot prove. Next comes instinct, another intermediate link between law and liberty,—a shackled intelligence pointing on to the intellect that is free. And rising above instinct, there is the teachableness of domestic animals, their endeavour to understand us, their power of yielding to or resisting temptation, their consciousness of having disobeyed,—all speaking of an imperfect choice and will, which they seem to derive from their intercourse with man. Yet, in spite of all this, we cannot fail to see how little each animal's welfare depends on the exercise of choice. The brute is at best an enslaved creature; but when man comes on the scene, he comes as the ruler of his own destiny. He is not a better and wiser beast formed to conquer others by a law of natural advantage, but the appointed heir of dominion, which he is free to keep or lose at his pleasure. Look at the educated Englishman and the Australian aboriginal; the one gaining more and more mastery over the laws of this world, the other almost as helpless a victim of those laws as the brutes around him. Never in nature's kingdom do we see this immense gulf between individuals of the same species; we see it in man alone, because he alone in creation was free to rise or fall. We need scarcely say how closely this freedom in working out his own physical destiny is associated with that higher freedom which belongs to the knowledge of good and evil. We conceive that in the creation of man God's attribute of freedom and earth's law of natural sequence were accurately balanced in the fact of probation. We know the fatal result; man used his free will to destroy his freedom, and thrust himself back by deliberate choice upon that law of natural sequence, which adds to sin the fruits of sin, and leaves no room for escape. And it was because man had upset God's balance, and subordinated advancing freedom to the old law of natural sequence, that it needed a manifestation of God, in which His free agency should triumph over natural sequence, to set the matter right. Hence the whole human economy becomes a system of most gracious interposition; for what is it we call grace and mercy, but God's direct interference with natural results? He interposes no less between cause and effect when He frees His enslaved creatures, and saves them from the fruit of their own sin, than when He saved their bodies from the Red Sea by causing the waters to stand on

either side. We marvel that those who own the greater wonder should shrink to grant the less; as if God might dare to interfere with immortal nature, yet hesitate to meddle with that of the physical world. He has not destroyed the system of natural law;—why should He, when it reflects half of Himself?—but He has chosen to arrest its uniform action by special interference. By grace, by providence, by miracle, He proclaims our whole economy to be one of merciful interposition, even while He permits the general operation of His laws to go on undisturbed. His compassion does not shrink from the stern behests of famine and pestilence. He strikes down His most useful servants, if they neglect the laws of health. He carries retribution with a high hand over the world, to remind us that His free interference shall not always arrest the course of law. As yet, it is forcibly arrested; the two principles are not now in harmony, but are working out their separate results in sheer defiance of each other. God saves by free interference with law, law inexorably destroys in spite of God's interference. But a time will come when the balance of law and liberty will be restored, when, standing before our just Judge, we receive the complex result of God's free mercy and our own life's doings. But whether we are advanced to the throne of God, or thrust out from His presence, the award of law will be given, not because we had been bound onward by development to either fate, but because we had been free to choose between them; because the Son of God had interposed between man and his natural destiny, and given back to His creatures a renewed power of choice, by which, when His Spirit called, they might have followed Him and been free. More than that even the Son of God could not do; for though it is conceivable that an Almighty Being might force men to be righteous, it is inconceivable, nay, it is a contradiction in terms, that any power could force men to be free. In our share of that essential attribute of Deity doubtless lies the whole mystery of good and evil. We catch a glimpse of moral necessity; a 'needs must be' that the creature which rises above the enslaved brute towards the free God, shall share the attribute of freedom, not as an arbitrary gift of the Creator, but as a necessity of our nearer approach to Him. Then cometh the end. We know not yet how the union of perfect stability with perfect freedom will be secured in a higher sphere; but this we know, that we shall share the nature of Him who is equally the source of liberty and the origin of law,—the Sovereign Ruler who is bound by righteousness, the Almighty One who *cannot* err.

- ART. II.—1. *American Slavery and Colour.* By WILLIAM CHAMBERS. London and New York. 1857.
2. *Life and Liberty in America: or, Sketches of a Tour in the United States and Canada in 1857-8.* By CHARLES MACKAY, LL.D., F.S.A. In Two Volumes. London. 1859.
3. *Slavery and Freedom in the British West Indies.* By CHARLES BUXTON, M.A., M.P. London. 1860.

AFTER all that has been written respecting American slavery, it is but imperfectly understood in this country. We have all formed some vague notion of a prodigious evil, poisoning the fountain of public morals, and embittering the social and political life of a great people. But how the mischief works; what are its economical aspects and effects; how it modifies political action, gives the tone to society, and affects foreign and domestic policy; these are mysteries known to comparatively few, and which many indeed have hardly opportunity to ascertain. And yet the phenomenon is of the widest and the utmost importance. It is the cardinal element in American politics; and periodically, as often as the term of presidential incumbency comes round, it gives rise to agitations which threaten the integrity of the great Transatlantic confederacy, and awaken the worst fears of the friends of human freedom and progress. It has more or less directly prompted and urged that course of conquest and territorial aggrandizement which has disgraced so many successive administrations, and made Americanism, in the judgment of a large part of the civilized world, a synonyme for brigandage and spoliation. It affects, in the most intimate way, the commercial relations of the United States, (especially with Great Britain,) and is thus bound up, for good or for evil, with the life of many nations.

The world cannot but be deeply interested in the phenomena of such an institution, especially as they become more striking and ominous every year. While we were bringing before our readers, in a recent number of this journal, some of the social aspects of American slavery, the question was entering upon a new and more threatening phase. The attempt of 'old John Brown' at Harper's Ferry,—bootless as to its immediate aim, but pregnant with mighty and fast-issuing results,—startled and agitated the American community, revealed more clearly the perils that environ the slaveholder, gave new hope and impulse to the friends of the Negro, and arrayed the opposing forces in a desperate and protracted conflict in the House of Representatives. This conflict, raging for more than two months, rendered all legislation impossible, because the elective body at Washing-

ton could not constitute itself, and awakened ominous murmurs and threats of physical force, in some parts of the Union. The world looked on, not only in wonder, but in the greatest apprehension. The South once more raised the cry of disruption, and it was universally feared that the crisis which would test the utmost strength and tenacity of the Union could not be much longer delayed. That crisis is rather deferred than passed. What will follow? Will the Free and Slave States part company? Will the North, rising to a sense of its dignity and duty, and putting forth its indomitable practical energy, conquer the South? or, will the South, by its old game of alternate bullying and flattery, overcome the North? If there be a revolution, will there also be a civil and a servile war? These solemn questions, with others, some of which are deep and terrible, are often pondered by the thoughtful philanthropist; and the solution seems more imminent than before.

These circumstances impart a special interest to American slavery; and they will perhaps be thought to justify a somewhat detailed reference to its economical working and results, and an outline of the leading features of its political history. We owe much on both these topics to the very clear and conclusive statements of Mr. Chambers's volume. For his economical statements he is indebted to those admirable and life-like pictures which Mr. Olmsted has drawn for us, and to those statistical returns to which we ourselves have access. But his chapters on the party manœuvring and political progress of the slave power have a special merit, as condensing and clearly putting this very important part of the case. Dr. Mackay supplies us, in his entertaining and instructive volumes, with notices of the latest phases of opinion among the slaveholders. And Mr. Buxton has condensed into ninety-two small pages a mass of invaluable evidence, demonstrating the good results of emancipation in our own West India Colonies, and abundantly confirming the conclusions of the other writers as to the relative merits of free and slave labour.

In contemplating the *ECONOMICAL ASPECTS* of slavery, we perceive that, at the very outset, the owner of slave property is at a disadvantage, inasmuch as he has to purchase, and pay a heavy price for, the article which he employs; and this disadvantage is increased, as, through various causes, that article is continually advancing in value. But let us epitomize a case remarkably well put by Mr. Olmsted. Suppose two immigrants, starting with a capital of 5000 dollars each, the one in Texas, the other in the free State of Iowa. They both begin by building a rude log hut; and by realizing, during the first year, a crop sufficient

for support during the second year. They both need a road, bridge, &c., to open communication with markets; both require frame houses, better agricultural implements, a grist mill, &c.; and both should by all means have a church and a school near at hand. The first labourer needed will be a carpenter, to erect the house. The Iowan advertises for one, with the offer of good wages; and presently he is supplied with a more or less skilful mechanic, without other cost than the remuneration of his labour. If the Texan venture to employ a skilled labourer, he must purchase him at Houston or New Orleans, at a cost, by the time he is in the owner's hands, of 2000 dollars. The Iowan, by advertising, or at most by advancing a trifling sum for travelling expenses, can get labourers to make roads, bridges, &c., and to clear, fence, and break up the land. The Texan can scarcely accomplish this without buying three more slaves; and then where are his 5000 dollars? The Iowan retains the means of buying good tools, machinery, &c. The Texan must do with very rude and primitive ones; for he has no money, and his human cattle would soon destroy any others. The Iowan, having skilful and trustworthy labourers, *whose interest it is to do their work well*, can spare time for discharging various civic duties, and cultivating the amenities of life; and is able, besides, to subscribe to necessary public works,—especially the mill, church, and school. The Texan's time is all occupied in superintending and driving his stupid and careless slaves, and he has no money left for any public purpose whatever. The Iowan has one or two thousand dollars still on hand, which he can invest in loans to mechanics, small shopkeepers, merchants, &c. Thus he helps to establish a trading community, and obtains command of the commodities and luxuries of life. As for the poor Texan, cotton alone will pay the cost of transport to cash customers; and therefore he plants as much as possible, generally more than can be reaped and packed by the hands in his possession. He therefore buys more,—*on credit*. As there are no shops, or public conveyances, he must import all that his hands and estate require; and is destitute of innumerable small comforts which the other enjoys. So palpable are these differences, that the Texan generally starts from a lower point of civilization than the Iowan; does not build a frame house, or buy a skilled labourer, but remains in a log cabin, and purchases only field hands; begins almost every season in debt, and often incurs still greater liabilities before he can realize his crop; and if at last, by earnest effort and favouring seasons, he grows cotton enough to overcome all these disadvantages, he has not risen in intelligence and virtue. Habit has accustomed him to a low

style of living at a high money rate; his family and dependents have been intellectually and morally neglected; and the result is, a state of semi-barbarism. The Iowan, on the other hand, has actively contributed to the material, intellectual, and moral improvement of his neighbourhood; has paid wages by the circulation of which he has been indirectly but largely benefited; has realized greater proportionate profit from using better implements and cattle, and enjoying cheaper and readier transit; and at last, instead of seeing himself beset by a gang of needy and helpless dependents, facetiously called 'property,' he is a prosperous member of a free and mutually helpful brotherhood, which he himself assisted to form, and to whose progressive welfare he has most materially contributed.

It may be deemed somewhat uncandid to compare a new and frontier State like Texas with an old State like New York. Yet the former has the advantage in climate, shares with other southern States the monopoly of a most profitable staple, and is at least equal to the average in a sanitary point of view. The nominal capital of New York farmers represents five times as much of the most truly valuable commodities of civilization as does that of Texan planters; and Texas would, in regard to the rapidity with which the discomforts and drawbacks of frontier life are overcome, have been ten times as prosperous as it is, 'had it been, at the date of its annexation, thrown open, under otherwise favourable circumstances, to free immigration, with a prohibition to slavery.' But we will shun every appearance of unfairness, and will look only at the older and more settled States, where the land is held by the lords of broad acres, who own hundreds of slaves, and live like noblemen. Let us compare Virginia with some of her contemporary free States.

This colony, prior to the Revolution, occupied the foremost place on the continent, in point both of wealth and population. As a State she now ranks fifth in wealth, and fourth in population; New York having in both respects supplanted her as the head of the Union. Yet the pro-slavery press frequently boasts of the superiority of Virginia in manufacturing and other facilities. Water-power, timber, granite, coal, iron, copper, lead, gypsum, abound in almost limitless profusion. The means of procuring and conveying agricultural and mineral products are unusually facile; and yet it is naïvely complained that this splendid country is dependent on Europe and the North for almost every yard of cloth, and every coat, hat, and boot that its inhabitants wear; for axes, scythes, tubs, and buckets; in short, for everything, except bread and meat. Everybody knows what a contrast is presented by New York, and still

more by some of the New England States, where, in spite of a barren soil and a rigid climate, freedom and industry have covered the country with all the signs of prosperity and happiness, and created an amount of wealth which is the world's marvel. Why this difference? The friends of slavery assert that whatever may be the cause, their institution is not concerned in it. Various reasons are assigned, but prominence is usually given to two; namely, the debilitating influence of the climate on white people, and the aristocratic descent of the white population from the 'gentlemen' who founded the colony. It is alleged that the blue blood of England's peerage, flowing in their superfine veins, indisposes them to commercial speculation. But these very apologists assert, and prove, that the climate is suitable for whites. Besides, climate and prosperity do not go together, in exact proportions, elsewhere. New Jersey has a similar climate, and a less fertile soil; yet the cash value of its farms is forty-four dollars per acre, while that of Virginia farms is only eight. According to this theory, Maine ought to be more prosperous than New Jersey, as its climate is much more bracing; but the respective values of land prove the reverse. Massachusetts, too, is more wealthy than States north of her, where more hardy races are supposed to live. In States between New York and Virginia, under a climate less bracing and less favourable to labour than that of New York, manufactures are proportionably more prosperous than in the Empire State. And—to say no more—any unfavourable climatic influence is more than balanced by the much longer period during which, in Virginia, the season remains open, and out-door labour practicable. As to the other reason,—after nearly three centuries of occupation,—the common climate and the fusion of races must have reduced the Virginians and their next neighbours pretty nearly to a uniform type. Besides, the assumption of gentle blood and aristocratic descent is mere delusion and pretence. The 'gentlemen' were a very small minority after colonial society was pretty well formed. Most of the ancestors of the present very respectable citizens were bought and sold as labourers. And as to the gentlemen,—they were ready enough to speculate in commerce, provided they could compel other people to do all the hard work for them. Here lies the true secret of the direction of their influence. Their territorial possessions and social rank gave them a preponderance in the legislature; and they used their power to perpetuate the accursed system from which has resulted the present humiliation of this splendid and beautiful State.

But Virginia lags far behind Free States admitted long years

after herself into the Union. Take, for instance, Ohio. The area in square miles respectively is, Virginia, 61,352; Ohio, 39,964. In 1790, Virginia had a population of 748,038, when Ohio was not incorporated, and was little better than a wilderness peopled by wild beasts and wilder men. In 1856, the population of Ohio was 2,215,750, or 703,157 more than that of Virginia, while its area is 31,388 square miles less. The cash value of farms in Ohio is 19.99 dollars, against 8.27 in Virginia, or 11.72 more per acre. In 1820, the population of Virginia was 483,945 more than that of Ohio, and the value of its manufactures greater by 1,396,272 dollars than that of Ohian manufactures. (By the way, it is significant that Ohio, with nearly half a million fewer inhabitants, should, in this item, have even then so nearly come up to the older State.) Both States made amazing progress during the next twenty years; but the Free State shot far a-head of the Slave. The value of Virginian manufactures in 1840 was 20,684,608 dollars; of Ohian, 31,458,401; a difference of 11,773,793 in favour of Ohio, whose population increased in the same period nearly 150 per cent., while that of Virginia only advanced a little more than 7 per cent. We have selected Ohio almost at random, or at all events choosing it because of its recent settlement; but any other State would have yielded analogous results. Our position is, that this portentous comparative deterioration in Virginia is owing to slavery; and we must try to make that position good.

In the first place, let us look at the comparative cost of free and slave labour. Five or six years ago, at a hiring of several thousand slaves in Eastern Virginia, the average wages paid to their owners were, as nearly as possible, 120 dollars per annum, with board and lodging for the slaves, and certain other expenses. As the great majority were agricultural slaves, we have a measure of the value of field labour in this State, which, with very unimportant modifications, is representative of the Slave States generally. Besides paying these wages, and feeding the slave, the hirer has to clothe him. In New York, at the same time, the wages of a free labourer, whether white or black, averaged about 108 dollars per annum, with board, but not clothing, in addition. Under this head free labour has the advantage in point of cheapness by about 25 per cent.

Secondly, look at the respective effects of inability to work as between free and slave labourers. The most humane and considerate employer of free labour can satisfy his conscience, and the reasonable claims of his men, in case of sickness or accident, at much less cost than the owner of slave labour; not to say that, if he is of only average humanity, this item will

involve him in hardly any cost; whereas the slave-owner, having so direct an interest in the *physique* of his human property, must pay all expenses. Then the slave often pretends to be ill, maims himself wilfully, refuses medicine, &c., it being his interest to be too unwell to work as often as he has a decent pretext. The free labourer's interest always is to get well as soon as possible. His instincts, and the wholesome laws of his condition, constrain him to depend rather on his own productive power than on the generosity of any employer. The loss by slave labour in this comparison is anything but trifling; and, if we add the very frequent cases of running away, and the expenses of pursuit and capture, the amount will be something serious. From many of these expenses the hirer of free labour is entirely free, and, if he so choose, may refuse to be burdened with any of them.

Thirdly, we may compare the way of working, and the amount of work performed respectively by free and slave labourers. On this point, a very large number of illustrative facts might be cited. Everywhere in the South, slaves of all classes are, on the confession of their owners, most inefficient servants. 'The slaves are excessively careless and wasteful, and in various ways, which, without you lived among them, you could hardly be made to understand, subject us to very annoying losses.' 'I don't think they ever do half a fair day's work. They can't be made to work hard: they never will lay out their strength freely; and it is impossible to make them do it.' 'Tools are used, such as no man, in his senses, with us, would allow a labourer, to whom he was paying wages, to be encumbered with; and the excessive weight and clumsiness of which, I would judge, would make work at least ten per cent. greater than those ordinarily used with us. And I am assured that, in the careless and clumsy way they must be used by the slaves, anything lighter or less rude could not be furnished them with good economy; and that such tools as we constantly give our labourers, and find our profit in giving them, would not last out a day in a Virginia corn-field, much lighter and more free from stones though it be than ours.' 'The waste in harvesting wheat in Virginia, through the carelessness of the Negroes, beyond that which occurs in the hands of ordinary northern labourers, is equal in value to what a northern farmer would often consider a satisfactory profit on his crop.' 'Four Virginian slaves do not, when engaged in ordinary agricultural operations, accomplish as much, on an average, as one ordinary free farm labourer in New Jersey.' These passages, taken as they come, from Mr. Olmsted's volumes, might be indefinitely multiplied. They show

how seriously the owner suffers from the listlessness, incapacity, and carelessness of his hands. The same fact was observed among our own West India Negroes prior to emancipation; and the reason for it is put most clearly and forcibly by Mr. Buxton.

'When a whole people is always looking at its work, with the eager thought, How not to do it, of course the result is, that it is not done; and though a sharp master may flog large work out of his slaves, yet most of them attain a high degree of proficiency in the art of leaving that undone which they ought to have done....But not only does Quashee, under this system, give his heart and soul to spending the greatest possible time on the least possible work; but it is a universal complaint of all slaveholders, that he grows so mindless, so shiftless, that agricultural and manufacturing improvements are impossible. No machinery can be intrusted to slaves. Wherever slave-labour prevails you must have the most primitive tools; you must eschew all the arts by which labour is made swifter. So heavily did this blight rest on the West Indies, that even the plough (*since become very common*) was unknown under slavery.'—*Slavery and Freedom*, pp. 25, 26.

What a world of evidence in favour of freedom do the four words which we have italicized supply!

Fourthly, the necessity of employing numerous overseers and 'nigger-drivers' must, on large estates, form a serious additional item in the expenditure. They are said to be, generally speaking, 'the laziest and most worthless dogs in the world,' intent far more on their own aggrandizement and the indulgence of their passions than on the interests of their employers. In America, the personal superintendence of the owner does something towards counteracting this mischief; but, on a large estate, his vigilance must be often at fault. Besides, the cultivation of rice, sugar, and cotton, is carried on in localities which, at certain seasons, are absolutely fatal to the whites; and, consequently, the owner and his family at such times live elsewhere, and matters are left very much to the discretion of the agents. In the West Indies, the effects of absenteeism were fearful, as, indeed, they must be even where labour is not compulsory; and, although the partial residence of American planters mitigates these effects, their partial non-residence must lead to the enhanced cost and diminished profit of slave labour. The West India planters were nearly all insolvent at the time of emancipation; and their ruin is attributed, by competent judges, very largely to this cause.

The 'conclusion to which these observations point is, that the cost of any certain amount of labour, by measure of tasks and not of time, is between three and four hundred per cent. higher in Virginia (and, *ceteris paribus*, in other Slave States too)

than in the Free States;' and this without reckoning the cost of clothing the slaves, loss of time by real or sham illness, and losses by theft, damage, carelessness, or 'rascality.'

The comparison may be pursued under another aspect. In Texas, a new and frontier State, the two systems are found in close proximity. They have in common the advantage of nearly virgin soil, and the drawbacks of frontier life. In Eastern Texas, there is hardly any labour but that of slaves. And here you may see 'an abandoned plantation of "worn-out fields," with its little village of dwellings, now a home only for wolves and vultures;' and the natural elements of its soil 'will have been more exhausted in ten years, and with them the rewards offered by Providence to labour will have been more lessened, than, without slavery, would have been the case in two hundred.' Judging by the number of their slaves, you would often deem the planters rich; but, besides being almost destitute of comfort, luxury, and social amenity, their lands at last show signs of exhaustion; and their prospects are either wholly or partially blighted by a sensible and serious diminution of the products of labour.

In Western Texas, on the other hand, there is a preponderance, or at least a very large infusion, of free labour; and the contrast is most extraordinary. It is well known that Germany has contributed a very large quota to the population of the United States. In 1843, the first German emigration to Texas occurred. It was commenced under high patronage; and in 1845 not fewer than 5,200 emigrants landed on Texan soil. Their patrons, however, having no idea of the toil and hardship incident to life in a new country, had most inadequately provided for them; they were shamefully deceived by land-speculators and adventurers; and, as the war with Mexico was at its height, and the country in a most disordered state, these poor creatures had to endure horrible hardships; and hundreds of them, in the march to the interior, perished most miserably. The first emigrants were chiefly poor peasants and mechanics, with a sprinkling of such as are compelled to 'leave their country for their country's good;' but, after the European troubles of 1848, numerous farmers and burghers, and not a few cultivated and high-minded men, compromised in various degrees with their respective governments, sought a home among their compatriots, where despotism and police surveillance could not reach them. In 1857, there were supposed to be 35,000 Germans in Texas, of whom 25,000 were settled in the western portion of the State. Long before this time they had forgotten all the wretchedness attendant on their arrival in the promised land. Smiling homesteads, clean and well-cultivated farms, neat and

solidly constructed vehicles, present, especially to the traveller from the East, a truly enchanting picture of prosperity.

Their slaveholding neighbours are strongly prejudiced against these Germans; speak depreciatingly of them; and often accuse them of purchasing slaves as soon as they acquire a little capital. But this is a slander. Mr. Olmsted never met with one, and does not believe there are thirty in all Texas. They show, on the contrary, 'the natural repugnance to a system of forced labour, universal in free society.' But the reasons for the planter's dislike are not far to find. There is not only the danger incident to his 'property,' from contact with free labourers unpleasantly near the Mexican frontier; but he is galled by more direct antagonism. 'The ordinary Texan wages for an able field hand are 200 dollars. The German labourer hires at 150 dollars, and clothes and insures himself. The planter for one such hand must have paid 1000 dollars. The German, with this sum, can hire six hands.'

Besides a large rural population, these exiles have several town settlements, of which the most conspicuous is Neu Braunfels, at the junction of the Comal with the Guadalupe. The street is more than a mile long, three times the width of Broadway in New York, and thickly lined on both sides with small, low cottages, scrupulously clean, nearly all painted or stuccoed, and having pretty gardens attached. The Guadalupe Hotel, kept by one John Schmitz, is a model of comfort and simple elegance, and contrasts most favourably, in its long and decorated saloon, its clean, varied, and abundant *cuisine*, and its perfect *boudoirs* of bed-rooms, with the filthy holes and abominable viands of the hotels in the slave region. The citizens are generally men of small capital; and about half of them follow the plough. There were, however, in 1857, sixty-eight master mechanics, employing several men each; and the place boasted of four grist-mills, a sash-and-blind factory, &c., and the erection of a cotton-mill was projected. There is a weekly newspaper; and the people have established an Agricultural Society, a Mechanics' Institute, a Harmonic Society, a Political Society, a Turners' Society, and a Horticultural Club. Five free common schools, one Roman Catholic ditto, a town free-school of higher grade, and a private classical school, give instruction both in English and German; and the teachers, according to the Yankee standard, are well paid. There are numerous signs of an educated, refined, and tasteful community, though they show curiously in juxtaposition with the primitive habits of frontier life. 'You are welcomed by a figure in blue flannel shirt and pendent beard, quoting Tacitus, having in one hand a long pipe, in the other a

butcher's knife.' Here are Madonnas upon log walls; there, coffee in tin cups upon Dresden saucers. You are invited to hear a symphony of Beethoven's on the grand piano, and are politely accommodated with a barrel as a seat. And you see 'a bookcase, half filled with books, and half with sweet potatoes.'

In the town gardens and small neighbouring farms, corn is commonly grown; but, when grain is too cheap, cotton is cultivated. This staple, however, will not be extensively produced until a mill has been built, or a railroad constructed; but, in 1856, 800 bales of free-grown cotton from this place fetched, in Galveston, from 'one to two cents a pound more than that produced by slaves, owing to the more careful handling of white and personally interested labourers.' Now, small as is the quantity concerned,—a mere drop in the bucket,—this fact shows how formidably these free Germans will compete with their slave-holding neighbours, when means of working up or transporting the raw material shall have been provided. All the prime cost of 'field hands' is avoided; the associated labour of a poor but free community, where every man does his best, is applied; and the result is, far less waste in gathering the crop, and such an augmentation in its value as must, when large quantities shall be grown, tell prodigiously in the market against its slave-grown rival. And, in addition, these free immigrants pursue a great variety of other occupations. Under slavery, time, energy, and capital are monopolized in the production of one all-engrossing article. But freemen choose for themselves; an endless variety of trades and professions is adopted; the comforts of life are consequently indefinitely multiplied; and society assumes an incomparably more refined and softened aspect. That such would be the case with the Negroes, may be seen from the change that occurred, after emancipation, in the West Indies.

'Under slavery, it of course paid best to set all the slaves to the same work, where one driver could keep an eye to them, and their industry could be increased. But it was a far more wholesome and profitable state of things, where one man could choose one kind of work, and one another, and a great variety of employment took the place of that monopoly.'—*Slavery and Freedom*, p. 48.

And now let us study the comparison as exhibited in certain grand totals presented to Congress, or recorded in official tables connected with the last census, that of 1850. The Slave States contain an area of 238,851 square miles more than the Free; they have a more genial climate, a more fertile soil, exhaustless motive power for manufactures, 7000 miles of sea and gulf coast, and more

than fifty navigable rivers, including the longest in the world. The Free States have generally a rigorous climate, and some of them a sterile soil. Their coast-line measures only 2000 miles. Of their twelve navigable rivers, two find their way to the sea through the Slave States, and the great lakes of the north and their outlets through the territory of Great Britain. The navigation of the southern rivers is always open, while that of the northern is mostly closed by ice several months in the year.

Keeping in view these very important differences, let the reader ponder the following statistics:—In 1850, the population of the Slave States was 9,612,769, or 11.28 on an average to the square mile. That of the Free States was 13,434,922, or 21.93 to the square mile. In 1790, the population in the respective sections was as nearly equal as possible. There were then nine Free and eight Slave States. Up to 1850, seven more of each had been added. The population of the former then exceeded that of the latter by 3,822,153, and six years afterwards by 5,093,986. At the same ratio, more than two-thirds of the entire population of the Union are in the Free States. In 1790, there were 50 per cent. more whites in the Free than in the Slave States: in 1850, there were 114 per cent. more. Thus, in point of population,—the great basis of national productiveness and wealth,—the balance is immensely in favour of freedom.

The following are some of the valuations connected with the land:—In 1850, the Free States contained, in a total area of 292,234,880 acres, 877,736 farms and plantations; the Slave, in an area of 544,926,720 acres, contained 564,203. In the Free States there were 57,688,040 acres of improved, and 50,394,734 of unimproved, land; in the Slave the numbers were respectively,—improved, 54,970,427; unimproved, 125,781,865. The cash value of farms, in the former, was 2,143,344,437 dollars; in the latter it was 1,117,649,649; average per acre, 19.83 and 6.18 dollars respectively. The worth of agricultural implements, &c., was: Free States, 85,736,658 dollars; Slave States, 65,345,625. The respective value of live stock and of all agricultural productions, according to the most reliable estimate, was: Free States, 858,634,334 dollars; Slave States, 631,356,917. Comparing the total values with the number of acres under cultivation, we have in the Free States a product of 7.94 dollars' worth per acre against 3.49 in the Slave; or, taking population as the basis, 3.42 dollars per head in the Free, against 1.71 in the Slave.

Under the head of manufactures, the comparison is as follows:—

	Free States.	Slave States.
Number of individuals and establishments employed	93,721	27,645
Capital embarked	430,240,051 dols.	95,029,879 dols.
Value of raw materials used ...	465,844,092 dols.	86,190,639 dols.
Hands employed—Male.....	576,954	140,377
" " Female.....	203,622	21,360
Annual wages	195,976,453 dols.	33,257,560 dols.
Annual product	842,586,058 dols.	165,413,027 dols.
Annual profit	376,741,966 dols.	79,222,388 dols.

It is not so easy to give correct commercial estimates; but the registered tonnage of American vessels in the two sections was, —in the North, 1,330,963 tons; in the South, 250,880: a difference of 500 per cent. ! The value of commercial products was 300 per cent. greater in the North than in the South. The aggregate value of exports and imports was, in the North, 631,396,034 dollars; in the South, 234,936,306: the North being worth nearly three times as much as the South. The foreign commerce of New York alone, in 1855, was, in exports and imports, worth 278,507,749 dollars; that of the entire South only 132,067,216, or not quite one half. The tonnage built was, in the Slave States, 52,959; in the Free, 528,844, or ten times as much.

In 1856, the value of real and personal estate, inclusive of that of slaves in the Slave States, was, in the Free States, 5,770,194,680 dollars; in the Slave, 3,977,353,946: a difference of 1,792,840,634 dollars in favour of the former; or, deducting the value of slaves, of 3,265,008,234 dollars. The value of real and personal estate in the North was at the rate of 14.72 dollars per acre; in the South, of 4.59 dollars.

Look at the following educational statistics:—The South has 59 colleges; the North, 61: the South, 450 college instructors; the North, 517: the South, 19,648 alumni; the North, 47,752: the South, 747 ministers educated in its colleges; the North, 10,702: the South, 5655 students; the North, 6895: the South, 308,011 volumes in collegiate libraries; the North, 667,297. In the South, there were 32 professional schools, with 122 professors, and 1807 students, in 1855; in the North, 65 schools, 269 professors, and 4426 students. Of private schools, the Slave States had, in 1850, 2797; the Free, 3197: teachers in the former, 4913; in the latter, 7175: pupils, 104,976, and 154,893, respectively. The public schools are,—Slave States, 18,507; Free States, 62,433: teachers, 19,307, and 72,621, respectively; pupils, 581,861, and 2,769,901 (!); annual income, 2,719,534 dollars, and 6,780,337. The number of adult whites unable to read and write in the Free States, in 1850, was 248,725; in the Slave

States, 493,026,—a number about twice as great in a white population of far less than half. In 1855, the total postage collected in the Slave States amounted to 1,553,198 dollars; in the Free States, to 4,670,725.

In the same year, the following were the amounts contributed to purposes of Christian benevolence.

	Bible cause.	Missions.	Tract cause.
Slave States...	68,125 dols.	101,934 dols.	24,725 dols.
Free States ...	319,667 dols.	502,174 dols.	131,972 dols.

The value of churches, in 1850, was 21,674,581 dollars in the South, and 67,773,477 in the North.

Long as is this array of statistics, it is concerned only with aggregate results; and several important items, (such as railroads, canals, and other public works,) as well as all comparisons between individual States, are omitted. We do not doubt that many of our readers will be surprised and even incredulous; but the above calculations are drawn from the most authentic sources. Wherever any doubt existed, the South has had the benefit of it; and, had we ventured to go into more minute detail, more extraordinary results still would have been shown. How infatuated and suicidal must be the policy that seeks to conserve and extend an institution whose effects are so disastrous!

But not only do such contrasts as these demonstrate how costly and extravagant a thing slavery is; not only does it fail in the competition with free labour, as to immediate productiveness; but the mean and beggarly results it does attain are achieved, in a great degree, at the cost of posterity. The ruinous and exhaustive character of slave agriculture is the theme of constant remark by those who have witnessed its effects. In Virginia, the difficulty of teaching slaves more than one kind of work, the listlessness of its proprietary body, and the inadequacy of that oversight without which slaves cannot be induced to labour, early led to the almost exclusive cultivation of tobacco, a crop for which the soil was especially adapted. Tobacco soon exhausts the land on which it grows; and in Virginia, especially in its eastern parts, the traveller passes through mile after mile of worn-out and useless land over which the primeval pine-forest has resumed its sway; and the whole country has a dilapidated and used-up look. This is more or less the case in the Slave States generally; but in Virginia the hand of decay is impressed everywhere. Governor Wise, the judicial executioner of 'old John Brown,' spoke more plainly than pleasantly on this point, when soliciting the 'most sweet voices' of his fellow citizens in 1855: 'You all own plenty of land; but it is poverty

added to poverty, poor land added to poor land; and nothing added to nothing makes nothing.....You have relied alone on the might of agriculture; and such agriculture! Your sedge-patches outshine the sun; your inattention to your only source of wealth has scared the bosom of mother Earth. Instead of having to feed cattle on a thousand hills, you have to chase the stump-tailed steer through the sedge-patches to procure a tough beef-steak.' So is the ground accursed anew by slavery.

The slaveholders of America are continually appealing to the case of the British West India planters, ruined, as they allege, by emancipation. But Mr. Buxton's book deprives them of all support in this quarter. We cannot attempt to analyse its contents; but the writer, while admitting great temporary suffering, completely establishes the superiority of freedom in the long run. We have been so long accustomed to hear of the ruin of the West Indies, that no doubt our readers generally will be surprised to hear that most of these fine old colonies are in a more flourishing state than ever. But, in the first place, emancipation was not really the cause of the misery and even overthrow of many of the old planters. Under slavery and monopoly, nearly all their estates were mortgaged, many of them far beyond their actual value.

'The system upon which the cultivation of sugar was carried on was this: the prodigious capital that was necessary for the purpose was annually furnished as a loan by West India merchants in London, the crop being then consigned to the lenders, and sold by them in England. Of course, they repaid themselves in the first instance; but it too often happened that, owing to various causes, amongst which droughts were the most frequent and fatal, the crop fell so short, that the advances of the merchants could not be repaid; and thus the West India proprietor became deeply indebted to them, and the heavy interest on the outstanding balances was so much dead weight on his property.'—*Slavery and Freedom*, pp. 36, 37.

Thus it happened that, at the time of emancipation, the large and important island of Jamaica was utterly insolvent. In addition to this insolvency, scarcely any of the planters were resident; and, in vast numbers of cases, one agent had charge of the estates of several absentee proprietors. In Jamaica, for instance, 123 estates were under the care of eleven gentlemen. In Montserrat, 23 were managed by one and the same agent. The consequences are too obvious to require specifying. Upon this body of ruined and helpless absentees fell the Free Trade measure of 1846, and sugar sank in value from 49s. per cwt. in 1840, to 23s. 6d. in 1848. Not merely was the planter ruined, because of the loss of profit resulting from this change; but, in

the above-named circumstances, he could not possibly command credit, and consequently the supply of capital was cut off. Neither Emancipation, nor Free Trade, nor both of them put together, ruined the ancient planters. At the worst, they only precipitated by a very few years *a crisis which slavery had produced and made inevitable*, and compelled that settlement which no insolvent, whatever be his talent or trick, can ultimately avoid. The real ruin of the planters was brought about under slavery and monopoly; and the other measures revealed, but did not beget, the poverty and misery of these unhappy men. But, that the West Indies themselves were not much injured by Emancipation and Free Trade, is plain from the following figures. The importation of sugar from our West India colonies has been as follows:—

	Cwt.
From 1841 to 1846 (six years before Free Trade)...	14,629,550
„ 1847 to 1852 (six years after)	17,918,362
„ 1853 to 1858	18,443,331

—proving to a demonstration that, if the old proprietors could not make money by growing sugar, others could; and that even the acknowledged lack of free labourers has not prevented a steady and rapid increase, which incontestably shows that the cultivation of free-grown sugar at Free Trade prices is remunerative. But the lack of labour has been purely local and temporary, and confined chiefly to those estates where, through want of capital, or other causes, wages were irregularly paid. We must pass over all Mr. Buxton's details; but the results must be given, as they prove, on the very ground chosen by the slaveholding interest, the immense economical superiority of free over slave labour.

In the last two clear years of slavery, (1832 and 1833,) these Colonies sent us 8,471,744 cwt. of sugar. In 1856 and 1857, they sent us 8,736,654 cwt., besides carrying on a large trade with Australia and the United States, which had no existence under slavery. Leaving out Jamaica, whose embarrassments are clearly to be traced to the superlative badness of its government,—a government without financial system, or any adequate arrangements for enforcing the law, and which engenders mutual distrust in the transactions of every-day life,—the comparison becomes far more striking. The other sixteen islands exported, during the last six years of slavery, an annual average of 3,007,782 cwt. in all. In the last four years, Great Britain alone has received from them an average of 4,055,521 cwt., besides their new trade to foreign lands. The export of rum from the same islands has increased from 2,722,880 gallons

under slavery, to 4,674,602 gallons under freedom. In 1857, the Colonial Bank received bills from the West Indies to the amount of more than £1,200,000, and less than £8,000 were returned. In that year of awful and universal panic, when some of the largest and oldest commercial houses in both the Old World and the New were overthrown, there was not one failure in the West India trade. In that year, Great Britain received from her West India Colonies 4,056,370 lbs. of coffee, being 878,545 more than the average of five preceding years; of cotton wool, 1,443,568 lbs., being 964,674 more than the previous five years' average. During the last seven years there has been an average annual increase in sugar of 457,119 cwt.; in rum, of 1,551,693 gallons; and in cocoa, of 1,567,758 lbs. In 1857, Great Britain exported to the West Indies £500,000 worth more than the average of the previous ten years; and in the four years then ending, the exports and imports of the West Indies together were worth £4,500,000 more than in the four years ending with 1853.

Along with all this, a great social change has taken place. The Negroes have built numerous new villages for themselves, where they live in neat and well-kept cottages, always comfortably, and often elegantly, furnished; and, in many instances, their little gardens are adorned with beautiful flowers, besides growing a plentiful and varied supply of vegetables. Many of them are freeholders, own large numbers of horses, hogs, and other live stock, and trade extensively in the native productions of their parishes. In Jamaica alone, nearly two hundred such villages have been built, and 100,000 acres of land purchased, by the emancipated Negroes; and, so far back as 1840, the island contained 9,340 Negro freeholders. Education is advancing among them; and though they are still in many respects an inferior race, they learn quickly, and crime is everywhere diminishing. They are often addicted, it is true, to lying and petty theft; but drunkenness is not common, and great crimes are very rare. On the whole, Quashee makes a creditable use of his freedom, and has shown himself docile, orderly, and peaceable. The results shall be summed up in Mr. Buxton's noble concluding words:—

⁴ The two main conclusions which are enforced upon us by our investigation are these: the one, that slavery and monopoly were bearing the West Indies to ruin; the other, that, under free labour and free trade, they are rising to great wealth. Under slavery and monopoly, the labouring class was miserable, and was perishing miserably. Under slavery and monopoly, the owners of the soil were reduced to the greatest pitch of distress. The state of affairs which

had arisen under this old dispensation had rendered a crash some day inevitable. But when once that blow had fallen, and the old things had passed away, and the new things had come, then the inherent virtue of the principle of freedom became manifest; and it is now working out the most beneficent, the most astonishing, what a few years ago would have seemed the most incredible, results. Wisdom has been justified of her children. Seeking only to do the thing that was just and noble,—seeking not to please herself, but to do the will of God,—England set free her slaves. It is plain that, but for her so doing, her Colonies would have sunk to irretrievable destruction. It proves now that, by so doing, she has set them on the way to a prosperity and happiness unknown before; that not only are the former slaves enjoying a degree of comfort and independence almost unparalleled, but that our own trade with these islands is becoming of higher and higher value. They are yearly enriching us more and more with the wealth of their fertile soil. Instead of being the plague of statesmen, the disgrace of England, they are becoming possessions to the British crown of incalculable value. Never did any deed of any nation show more signally that to do right is the truest prudence than the great deed of emancipation.

“ Not once or twice, in our rough island story,
The path of duty was the path of glory.”

And in her dealings with the Negro race, both in the West Indies and in Africa, England, having “only thirsted for the right,” has already begun to find the wisdom of that course. The fight for freedom has been fought amid great discouragement; for a time there were heart-breaking drawbacks to the success attained. But it has been fought with a good courage. And now the spread of commerce and civilization in West Africa, the happiness of the happiest peasants in the world in the West Indies, the improving agriculture, the extending trade of these islands, the cheering news which governor after governor is sending home of their thriving state, such is the reward to her own self, as well as to them, which England is reaping from her generous, self-denying, Christian policy.’—*Slavery and Freedom*, pp. 91, 92.

If it be asked, How it is possible, with so comprehensive and complete a demonstration of the economical superiority of free and slave labour, for the latter to hold its own? how, especially, it is not expelled from those States where the two are in juxtaposition? we answer: The natural and healthy operation of the law of supply and demand is artificially counteracted by the influence of the slave-owner in degrading labour, and by that of the only labour which he employs. The free labourer, migrating into Virginia from Europe or the North, soon discovers that a day's work there means very much less than a day's work elsewhere; and of course he insensibly accommodates himself to the new standard. Why should he tax his thews and sinews more

than the labour customs of the State require? And is it likely that he will escape the demoralizing influence of association with labourers who only work from fear, and do as little as they can, and, as workmen, are looked upon as a mean and inferior race? Except in such cases as that of the German settlements in Texas, where labour is conducted very largely on the associative principle, and the free community holds next to no intercourse with the slave, free labour has no chance of developing its true energies, and realizing its legitimate fruits, in immediate contact with slave labour. The mean whites and free people of colour in the older Slave States are as bad as the slaves themselves, and perhaps a shade worse; but it is the close proximity of slavery, with its lazy, clumsy, soulless victims, and its immoral and licentious habitudes, that makes them so. When Samson lays his grand head in Delilah's lap, and suffers the loss of his abundant locks, he is no longer the champion of freedom or the type of strength.

Let us now attempt to draw a brief sketch of the *POLITICAL AND PARTY HISTORY* of the slave question in the United States. More than the barest outline it is impossible to give, unless one had been educated on the spot in a knowledge of the ever-changing phases of a democratic society, and had received a special training in that department of extraordinary political nomenclature which Brother Jonathan has cultivated to such perfection. But some review of the past is necessary, if we would have only a moderately correct understanding of the present attitude and prospects of the respective powers of freedom and slavery, and form any conception of the tendency of the conflict that thickens its complications day by day.

At the outbreak of the War of Independence, slavery existed in most, if not all, of the Colonies, having been forced upon some of them by royal mandate. This much an English antagonist of the great American 'institution' is bound, in fairness, to confess. During the interregnum, from 1784 to 1789, following the war, the States were governed by what was called the Continental Congress. To this body certain territories on the north-west of the Ohio were ceded, on condition that their debts and liabilities incurred during the war should be liquidated. In 1787, a law was passed, enacting that 'there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, otherwise than in punishment of crime, whereof the parties shall be duly convicted.' Jefferson made a great effort to carry a similar measure for territories south of those named above; but, though his coadjutors deeply deplored slavery, and sincerely desired its removal, they believed that any attempt at emancipation through federal agency

would alienate the slaveholders, and jeopardize the consolidation of the States. Accordingly, Jefferson's efforts failed. The majority preferred to rely on public opinion, which at that time gave indications of a bias towards freedom. Massachusetts, for instance, took the lead in abolishing slavery; and other States soon more or less followed her example. In the constitution finally adopted, representatives and taxes were allocated according to numbers; and the extraordinary plan was hit upon of adding to 'free persons, including those bound to servitude for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons,' namely, slaves. The slaves themselves have no votes; and of course the white population of the Slave States have all the advantage of this astounding clause, and practically that advantage is monopolized by some 350,000 slaveholders. It was also ordered that 'the migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress, prior to the year 1808; but a tax or duty may be imposed, not exceeding ten dollars on each person.' It was further provided that slaves, escaping from one State to another, should be delivered up in all cases, on claim of the party to whom their labour might be due. The Federal Government was empowered to suppress insurrections of slaves, if necessary, with its whole force; and Congress 'shall have power to dispose of, and make all rules and regulations respecting, the territory or other property belonging to the United States.' All this legislation gave evident and very decided advantages to the pro-slavery element from the very beginning. The first Congress, however, under the Constitution, meeting in 1789, adopted Jefferson's ordinance of 1787, and thereby for ever excluded slavery from the territories now comprising Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin. Unhappily, this same Congress failed to adopt any measures calculated to prevent the extension and permanent intrenchment of slavery in the South.

+ The location of the federal capital, though effected by Washington's own influence, was another wrong and most unfortunate step. Carved out of the Slave States of Maryland and Virginia, the district of Columbia is a slave municipality, of which the great officers of the Union are the civic magistrates. Thus, in a measure, is the whole Confederation implicated in upholding slavery; and the constant spectacle of slaves as servants, and of slave depôts and auctions, together with the proverbial laxity of morals in slave society, could hardly fail to injure the more susceptible and less conscientious of the northern representatives. No doubt this circumstance has tended not a little to produce

that unfaithfulness to the principles of freedom, which has ever and anon, in the struggles of party, been the bane and the disgrace of northern statesmen.

In 1803, a huge territory, situate on the west bank of the Mississippi, larger than all the old thirteen States put together, was purchased from France. The inhabitants were secured, by the Bill of Incorporation, in the enjoyment of all their existing property, rights, and privileges. As holding slaves was one of these, it was of course retained. It is most unaccountable that such a clause should have been allowed by the North, seeing that it could not but give an immediate and immense political advantage to the South. But the North was not true to herself. The race of revolutionary fathers was dying out, and public spirit had sensibly declined; while the South, by patronage and smooth promises in some cases, and in others by insolence, threats, violence, and actual duels,—so naturally does slavery ally itself with Judge Lynch, revolvers, and the bowie-knife,—succeeded but too well. The Free States were now placed, politically, almost at the mercy of the South, which has used its advantage to exclude them from any share of power, except in subserviency to its own views. And so, with the single exception of John Quincy Adams, every subsequent President has been either a Southern slaveholder, or,—what the South greatly prefers,—‘a Northern man with Southern principles.’

The history of the Missouri Compromise, by which, in 1820, while admitting Missouri as a Slave State, it was provided that, in future, slavery should be for ever excluded from all the territory north of 36° 30' north latitude, is, we presume, sufficiently known. It is worth while noting, however, that the name of Henry Clay comes up disreputably in connexion with this affair. Mr. Chambers speaks of this renowned statesman as one whose mission seems to have been that of inventing compromises. The draft of the Missourian State-Constitution contained clauses forbidding the settlement of free people of colour in the State. The North violently opposed these clauses, and had every hope of securing their rejection; but Clay hit upon a notable expedient for reconciling the contending parties, and securing the passing of the Bill of Incorporation, by exacting from the State Legislature a pledge that it would take no advantage of its Constitution, and pass no Act ‘to exclude any of the citizens of either of the States’ from the privilege they enjoy under the Constitution of the United States. The question as to who are citizens, within the meaning of the Constitution, was left open; and of course that is to the advantage of the South. Missouri, meanwhile, was admitted into the Union, ‘a full-blown Slave State,’

projecting a long way north into free territory, and so greatly interfering with the course of free migration westward. The value of unprincipled public compromises, and of American State pledges, has just been illustrated in this very business. A recent mail brings word that the Missouri Legislature has passed a Bill to forbid the presence of free people of colour in the State. The governor has, indeed, vetoed the Bill; but, in all probability, his veto only postpones, for a time, the enacting of such a measure. When his successor comes to be elected, the elegant 'border ruffians' of Missouri are very likely to look out for some less scrupulous personage, and secure his pledge to do their bidding.

Florida was next procured from Spain, as a Slave State. In the negotiations connected with its cession, 'smart' brother Jonathan just hinted that he conceived he had a claim to a certain country called Texas, which, he said, had been included in the Louisianian purchase. The hint, no doubt, helped to bring the *Hidalgos* to reason about Florida; but they were sadly mistaken if they thought their keen neighbours would forget or forego it. In 1834 and 1835, after the Mexicans had thrown off the Spanish yoke, certain indications appeared that this Texan claim might possibly be revived in a very definite and tangible shape before long. One of those curious and significant immigrations took place, by which our worthy cousins have been accustomed to prepare the way for territorial acquisition.

'The condition of affairs in America is at all times favourable to the commission of daring exploits by private adventurers, whose acts can be repudiated or sanctioned, as circumstances shall determine. In no country in Europe could be found groups of individuals at all to compare with these adventurers, of the true filibuster type. They are the refuse of the world,—penniless, reckless, confident, and unscrupulous; refugee Poles, Italians, and Frenchmen; exiles from the British islands, bankrupt in character and fortune; Portuguese and Spaniards, with predatory habits acquired in the slave-trade or in freebooting; immigrant Germans, who, instead of pushing off to inland rural settlements, as is usual with their countrymen, have become frequenters of taverns, and copiously indulge in "lager beer;" sons of American gentlemen, who, brought up without restraint, and having gone through their fortune, loiter about bar-rooms and gaming-houses, get up dog and cock-fighting matches, and at night tormenting the streets as rowdies;—all are ready for any sort of mischief. Such are some of the elements of a filibustering expedition, of which, however, the "white trash" of the South, by whom honest labour is deemed a disgrace, usually form the staple material. Equip, arm, and ship off company after company of this heterogeneous mass; see them land in grotesque costume, their trousers stuffed into dirty boots, their red

woollen shirts, their rusty beards, hats of every imaginable shape, belts stuck with bowie-knives and revolvers, and rifles slung over their shoulders,—chewing, spitting, swearing,—and you have an army of marauders such as, we venture to say, could be nowhere else produced on the face of the earth.’—*American Slavery and Colour*, pp. 49, 50.

Such men as these, armed to the teeth, entered Texas in companies, under doughty leaders, at the time in question, and they were followed by ‘flocks of greedy speculators and jobbers, holders of scrip in real or pretended joint-stock-land companies, besides a floating mass of adventurers anxious to secure whatever good might fall in their way.’ It was obvious and easy, as soon as the motley population of citizens were strong enough, to get up a quarrel with the landlord, and turn him out. This was accordingly done. The Mexican authorities, upon securing their own independence, had abolished slavery; but the Americans brought it with them across the border, and revived it in their new domain. Daniel Webster and others in vain strove to prevent the annexation of Texas with the incubus of slavery attached. The huge territory, out of which the South expects to carve at least five Slave States, was added, without any prohibition of slavery, in 1845. Nor was this great gain to the South effectually counterbalanced by the organization of Oregon in 1847, Minnesota in 1849, and Washington in 1853, as Free Territories. Even the defeat of an attempt to run the line, south of which slavery might exist, to the Pacific, and thus to secure the legalizing of the ‘institution’ over all Southern acquisitions, was an imperfect triumph for the North. Still, it was a valuable one. ‘The game of pitching States into the Union’ went on so rapidly, that Northern territory was ‘pretty considerably used up.’ The North became alarmed at the much vaster field for the extension of slavery in the South, and by hard fighting secured, at least for a time, the very valuable chance of pushing free territory southward, and so turning the flank of its detested rival. Stimulated by this success, and stung by the annexation of Texas, the abolition party became more united and aggressive, and loud demands began to be heard for the emancipation of the federal district of Columbia. While the North, however, was ‘stumping it’ among mobs, and vociferating in mass meetings on this question, the South deftly secured, without remonstrance, and almost without observation, that triangular piece of territory, comprising six fertile counties previously free, which was added to Missouri, brought under slavery, and has been the hot-bed of the mob of ‘border ruffians,’ who have given to the State in question its unenviable notoriety.

When California applied for admission, the two sections of

the Union were in violent conflict, the North seeking to abolish slavery in Columbia, the South to compel the North to assist in the recovery of fugitive slaves. Hereupon Compromise Clay makes his appearance again, and carries a Plan of Conciliation, in several Bills, in 1850. It was agreed that not Congress, but the inhabitants of the newly-acquired Southern territories, should decide upon the admission or exclusion of slavery therein. On this basis,—to which the now famous, or infamous, name of 'squatter sovereignty' was given,—California was admitted as a State, and Utah and New Mexico as Territories. The only concession to the North, as it appears, was the abolition, not of slavery, but of the slave-trade and public slave-sales, in Columbia. But, as if to make even this paltry grant worthless, 'the Fugitive Slave Bill strengthened those provisions in the Federal Constitution for recovering runaways which in many parts of the country had become practically inoperative.' On this occasion, the gifted and lamented Webster voted in opposition to his own avowed principles. His vote destroyed the confidence of his friends, and led to his rejection as a candidate for the presidential chair; and this token of the displeasure of those whose good opinion he most valued, is believed to have led to his untimely death. Soon afterwards his tempter, Henry Clay, descended into an unhonoured grave. On the whole, the South decidedly gained by these 'omnibus measures'; though it is pleasing to record that California exercised her right of squatter sovereignty by excluding slavery. The North, too, while bitterly exasperated at the passing of the Fugitive Slave Bill, has generally disregarded it, and it is not much more operative than the provisions which it superseded.

The history of the next struggle in the series has already been detailed in these pages.* We must, however, to maintain the continuity of our present sketch, remark, that the case of Kansas illustrates the views with which the South insisted upon and carried squatter sovereignty, and the barbarous and unscrupulous use which it is prepared to make of its advantage. The 'Missouri Compromise' was rejected as a fond tradition; the outrageously immoral doctrine was proclaimed that the legislation of thirty years ago had no right to bind posterity; and it was contended that the Compromise was inconsistent with the solemnly recognised rights of squatter sovereignty. Two Bills, organizing Kansas and Nebraska upon the basis of such sovereignty, were passed; and then followed those diabolical outrages which need not have any further record here; outrages

* See Article 'Kansas,' vol. viii., p. 517.

perpetrated on the *bond fide* free-soil settlers by those notorious ruffians from Missouri, who never intended permanent occupation of the country, but were bent, by the manufacture of faggot votes, and wholesale rapine and murder, upon compelling the adoption of slavery. The struggle is scarcely yet over,—the governor of Nebraska having vetoed the Bill of its Legislature for the abolition of slavery. Here, however, there is reason to hope, democracy may save freedom; and that the will of the legally constituted representative assembly will, after all, prevail.

If we refer any further to this Kansas episode, it is simply to say, that John Brown appears to have gained his first celebrity as an Abolitionist in connexion with it. His sons had emigrated to Kansas, and soon became obnoxious for their free principles to their ruffian neighbours of Missouri. Summoned to their aid, the old man soon joined them, and took a prominent part, both by word and deed, in the events of 1855 and 1856. After the sack of Laurence, and the burning of his own village, Ossawatimie, by the Missourians, Brown fought and conquered, against great odds, more than one strong party of his opponents, drove them back across the border, and mainly contributed to secure freedom to the State. An attempt, indeed, was made, in 1858, to invade it again; but the brave old man replied by a night visit to two estates in Missouri. Waking up the masters, 'he ordered out their waggon, put their slaves into them, and, compelling the masters to accompany him, drove slaves and masters over the border.' He led them through Kansas, Iowa, and Illinois, into Canada, and there, in the presence of their owners, who had followed him all the way at a respectful distance, he set free the Negroes, eleven in number, giving them money and counsel, which have done them good service ever since.*

Great results have already followed the Harper's Ferry outbreak. The South appears to have been driven mad with rage and terror. Governors of Southern States are crying aloud for a Southern Convention, to procure the dissolution of the Union; and Southern Legislatures are waxing more and more stringent against free people of colour, and whites from the North. Moreover, the slaveholders are in a perfect panic, and it is the universal practice, not only for the masters, but for the fair and

* We are indebted for these notices to a paper from the pen of Mr. W. E. Forster, in the February number of our new and talented monthly contemporary, *Macmillan's Magazine*. The reader will find the paper in question full of interesting particulars about this remarkable man.

delicate females of their families, to sleep with loaded revolvers and sharp steel close at hand,—so great is the dread of a servile insurrection. It is clear, that old Brown only intended to repeat on a somewhat larger scale in Virginia his Missouri experiment of 1858; but his *émeute* is so generally known among the Negroes, and has kindled such wild hopes in their breasts, that their masters tremble for their lives.

All over the South, a perfect frenzy of hatred against the North prevails. On the 8th of December, no fewer than twenty-eight gentlemen, agents of New York and Boston houses, arrived in Washington from New Orleans and other southern cities. They had been compelled to retire, Vigilance Committees having been formed to detect and drive out Northerners. Northern-born citizens have been disfigured, driven from their homes, and compelled to fly. Orders for Northern goods have been extensively countermanded, and a general conviction of the instability of the Union is prevalent. On the other hand, in the recent State elections, the North has given its decided adhesion to freedom. This was the case even in New York, where the pro-slaverists used every possible effort to implicate their opponents in Brown's unfortunate movement, and were confident of success. Even moderate and temporizing men consider the old man who bore himself so bravely, and died so meekly, to be a martyr in the cause of humanity, and have rallied to the Republican side in overwhelming numbers. The *Times* newspaper, with that perverse spirit which it has lately shown on the slavery question, made much of a meeting in New York, with the objects of which three or four ex-Presidents avowed their sympathy, at which it was resolved that slavery was a Divine institution, to be upheld in the country by all possible means; but the correspondence of that journal shows that the hostility to slavery in the Free States is greater than ever; and that New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, hitherto 'trimmers,' must be counted as won over to the side of freedom. It is evident, too, that the anti-slavery party is in the majority in the House of Representatives, and it is said to have vastly improved its position in the Senate.

If we are to judge of the future by the past, there is not much to re-assure us. Hitherto, in almost every struggle, the South, even when apparently worsted, has gained the principal advantage. With its small and compact constituency of slaveholders, bound by a common interest, and having abundant leisure for playing the game of politics, it has been more than a match for the heterogeneous and busy North. It has possession of the executive, and; by the far-extending range and minute ramifica-

tions of the patronage thus at its disposal, it can create a powerful and unscrupulous pro-slavery party in the bosom of free society; and thus, in spite of its numerical and industrial inferiority, it has nearly always kept the North at bay, and generally conquered it. Moreover, the North has not been true to itself. Its astute rival has cajoled it by professing the extreme democracy which, next to money, is the idol of the North; and has corrupted it by the bribe of thirty per cent. protective duty on Northern manufactures. It has long been well understood that much of the magniloquent outcry of the North was mere wind. In fact there never has been a struggle for emancipation. The question has never gone beyond the extension or limitation of slavery; and the golden apple has been, not the rights of man, or the claims of the wronged and insulted slaves, but political power: Shall the North or the South govern the Union? Once more: devotion to the Union is the predominant sentiment, at least with Northern Americans; and the bugbear of Disruption, judiciously put forward on every occasion by the Southern party, is always sufficient to frighten their rivals into compliance and subserviency. Such has been the case hitherto, and it remains to be seen whether the new Republican party can resist the spells which have enchanted and paralysed its predecessors.

The true friends of the Negro race in America constitute but a small and feeble band. The Christian Anti-Slavery Society was a noble institution, embracing some of the finest spirits that ever adorned any land or cause; but, in that world of caricature, there has arisen by its side a very misshapen and distorted thing, calling itself the Abolition Society, whose watchwords are Disunion, Revolution, Abolition. If anything can lead to a peaceable solution of the question, it will be the Gospel, as the members of the former Society well understood.

A valuable collateral agency must be recognised in the Cotton Supply Association, formed in this country. It is the object of that Association, by promoting the cultivation of cotton in India, Africa, and elsewhere, partly to increase that supply of the raw material, which, in spite of the amazing development of slavery, is all too small for the demand; and partly to lessen the dependence of England on a country which is in many respects her rival, and may at any time become her enemy. The association is in communication with Dr. Livingstone and others in Africa, and has the goodwill and co-operation of our Government, especially in India. In a recent number of its organ, *The Cotton Supply Reporter*, it is asserted that, in the event of any casualty seriously affecting the American sources of supply,

'there need be no fear but that, within a reasonable time, by the help of capital, all the cotton we require could be obtained at a cheaper rate than we are now paying for it.' In confirmation of this, we perceive that Mr. Macgregor Laird has just sent over from the Niger a sample of cotton bought at from one penny to twopence a pound, which the Association values at sevenpence, accompanying it with the remark that 'gins and presses are all that we require to enable us to purchase any quantity of the merchantable article, as there is plenty of the raw cotton to be had.' The highest authorities in the House of Lords,—such men as Lord Brougham and the Bishop of Oxford,—are agreed that an extensive supply of African and Indian cotton would not only modify slavery across the Atlantic, but annihilate the African slave-trade, without which, and kindred measures, the planters declare they cannot furnish the market with the needed quantity. That supply is likely, indeed, to be slowly and partially obtained at first, but its subsequent development will no doubt be extremely rapid.

- ART. III.—1. *Munimenta Gildhallæ Londoniensis. Liber Albus.* Compiled A.D. 1419. Edited by HENRY THOMAS RILEY, M.A. Published by the Authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. London: Longmans. 1859.
2. *The Chronicle of England.* By JOHN CAPGRAVE. Edited by the Rev. F. C. HINGESTON. Published by the Authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. London: Longmans. 1858.
3. *De Antiquis Legibus Liber. Chronica Majorum et Vicecomitum Londoniarum, &c.* Nunc primum Typis mandata, curante THOMA STAPLETON. Londoniis: Sumptibus Societatis Camdenensis. 1846.
4. *Chroniques de London depuis l'An 44 Hen. III. jusqu'à l'An 17 Edw. III.* Edited from a MS. in the Cottonian Library by GEORGE JAMES AUNGIER. London: Printed for the Camden Society. 1844.
5. *The Domesday of St. Paul's of the Year 1222: or, Registrum de Visitatione Maneriorum.* Per ROBERTUM Decanum, &c. With an Introduction, Notes, and Illustrations, by WILLIAM HALE HALE, Archdeacon of London. Printed for the Camden Society. 1858.

6. *Some Account of Domestic Architecture in England, from the Conquest to the End of the Thirteenth Century, &c.* By T. HUDSON TURNER. Oxford: John Henry Parker. 1851.

'AMONGST the noble cities of the world, honoured by fame, the city of London is the one principal seat of the kingdom of England, whose renown is spread abroad very far; but she transporteth her wares and commodities much farther, and advanceth her head so much the higher. Happy is she in the wholesomeness of the air, in the Christian religion, her munition, also, and strength, the nature of her situation, the honour of her citizens, the chastity of her matrons. Very pleasant, also, in her sports and pastimes, and replenished with honourable personages.'

With this curious farrago of praises, Fitz-Stephen, who died at the end of the twelfth century, commences his description of London. His tract is one continued flourish of trumpets; the enthusiasm of Charles Lamb for the modern city is mere apathy beside the raptures of the monk of Canterbury. London, he tells us, is more ancient than Rome, and, like it, is sprung from Troy. It was the birth-place of Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, and of Thomas à Becket, the greatest of modern saints. With professional accuracy, he remembers that it is not the seat of the metropolitan diocese; but it was once, and it would be again, if the citizens would return into 'the island,' whatever district may be intended by that name. Its matrons are comparable to the Sabine women; its men, respected for their civil demeanour, their excellent apparel, their talk, and their table. It has the best soil, the most fertile gardens, the clearest springs, the strongest walls. Its sports, its miracle plays, its schools, its markets, are all lauded in adjectives ending in *issimus*. Its air is so clear, that it calms men's bad passions, 'preserving them from savage and rude behaviour.' Its churches have the most appropriate customs for honouring God's ordinances, entertaining of strangers, giving of alms, observing of festivals, and celebrating religious rites. 'Its only pests are immoderate drinking of idle fellows, and often fires.' But the modern reader will smile at learning that the panegyric reaches its climax in describing Smithfield and the water-side.

We are in a fair way of being able to test the truthfulness of many such old chroniclers. The research of learned antiquarians, steadily pursued amidst much ignorant ridicule, has disintegrated for us a mass of information about the domestic life of our ancestors, such as we believe to be possessed by no other nations. The formation of societies of learned men, amongst which the *Camden* stands pre-eminent, has presented us with

London in the Thirteenth Century.

reproductions of works that give an insight into the homes of merry England; whilst our thanks are especially due to the editors of the books enumerated at the head of this article for the very interesting and elaborate introductions and notes by which they have illustrated their authors. Above all, the Commissioners of the Treasury have authorized the publication of certain MSS. which have long lain buried in their dusty receptacles,—a work beyond the capacity of private enterprise. We propose to take a glance into some of these, and gather a specimen of such of their contents as pertain to London in the thirteenth century.

The city was enclosed in a twofold circle, the inner of which was formed by the wall. Starting from the Tower Liberties, (which were, from time immemorial, subject to the peculiar jurisdiction of the king's lieutenant, and the cause of frequent conflict with the Corporation,) the wall was first pierced by the postern-gate; and its course may be traced by the names that still remain, indicating the position of the different outlets: Aldgate, or Oldgate, Bishopsgate, Cripplegate, Aldersgate, Newgate, and Ludgate, being all at this period actual gates in the wall. From Ludgate to the Thames the rampart ran along the bank of the Fleet river; and the south side of the city was also once 'walled and towered; but the fish-abounding river of Thames,' (says Fitz-Stephen,) 'with his ebbing and flowing, hath long since subverted them.' Of the wall itself Stow writes: 'It appears like a natural rock, with the stones so cemented into the work, that nothing but the greatest violence can separate them.' It was some six or seven feet in breadth. The space thus enclosed was far from considerable, and the whole boundary line, including the course of the Thames, was but three miles and thirty poles.

The picture of the wall at this period would be far from complete without some account of the different gates and the events with which they were connected. Early in the century, during the contest between King John and the Barons, the army of the latter broke through Aldgate: being favoured by the great body of the citizens, and having gained over the capital to their side, they then proceeded to plunder the houses of the friars, and next attacked the dwellings of the Jews, who were commonly the victims of any outbreak at this period. When they had by these means filled their own purses, 'they after, with great diligence, repaired the walls and gates of the city with stones from the Jews' broken houses.' Which act of disinterested generosity seems to have raised them greatly in the estimation of the citizens. The different gates were buildings of considerable size,

including dwelling-houses. Aldgate was inhabited by the canons of the Holy Trinity; Bishopsgate, by those of St. Mary Spittle; Cripplegate was a prison for debtors; Newgate, a like receptacle for felons and trespassers.

The name of the latter portal is a curious instance of the persistency of a designation long after the period which rendered it in any way appropriate. Its origin was as follows. The rebuilding of St. Paul's, which had been burnt about the year 1086, caused great inconvenience to the traffic of the neighbourhood. The direct passage from Ludgate in the West to Aldgate in the East was blocked up, 'and the carriages through the city were forced to pass on the north side through Paternoster Row, Ave Maria Lane, and Bowyer Row, to Ludgate, or else out of Cheap or Watheling Street, through Old Change, Carter Lane, and Creed Lane. Which passage, by reason of so often turning, was very cumbersome and dangerous both for horse and man. For remedy whereof, a *new gate* was made and so called, by which men and cattle, with all manner of carriages, might pass more directly.' *

The charges for repairing the wall and its gates are frequently mentioned in the records of this century. The burden seems to have been a heavy one, and various devices were resorted to in order to meet it. In one instance, already alluded to, the repairs were executed with stones from the Jews' houses; and one of these, engraven with Hebrew characters, was discovered when Ludgate was rebuilt at the close of the sixteenth century. The duty of keeping Bishopsgate in repair was saddled upon the merchants of the Haunse, (Hans Towns,) and about the beginning of Edward the First's reign the Dutchmen were presented by some of the wards to the King's judges itinerants, sitting at the Tower, because they do not sustain Bishopsgate so well as they ought to do. Newgate, as a public prison, was maintained at the cost of the royal exchequer.

The outer circle marked the liberties of the city without the walls. These may still be traced by the names of bars which have been preserved to our own time. Starting from Temple Bar the line runs by Shire Lane and Chancery Lane to Holborn Bars, where two posts and a chain were standing up to a recent period. Hence it followed an irregular course by Furnival's Inn, Ely Place, and Hatton Garden to Smithfield Bars. Goswell Street, New Cross Street, Grub Street, Bishopsgate Street, and Whitechapel, all had their bars, and the line ended on reaching the Tower Liberties. The whole space thus enclosed did not exceed three hundred acres.

* Stow, book i., p. 19.

It may be interesting to give a description of the capital at this period; and in doing so, we shall be very largely indebted to Mr. Aungier's admirable introduction to the French Chronicle of London.

Leaving Westminster, which was at this period the frequent residence of royalty, the visitor at the close of the thirteenth century, as he proceeded eastward along the Strand, would pass by the houses of many of the nobles. We frequently meet with mention of grants of vacant spaces of ground in this locality for building, in the reigns of Henry III. and Edward I., to prelates or barons. Amongst others, Walter le Spencer and the Bishops of Exeter and Coventry had houses near the Thames. As yet the Strand formed a part of the river's bank, after other parts in its vicinity had lost their native character and appearance. The name was still confined to the shore, and the line of houses was termed 'the High Street.' The footway was so bad, 'that the feet of horses, and rich and poor men, received constant damage, particularly in the rainy season. The path was also interrupted with thickets and bushes.' On the site of the present church of St. Mary-le-Strand stood a cross, whereat 'in the year 1294 and divers other times the justices itinerants sate without London.' Hard by was the may-pole, the scene of so much rejoicing, and of one fatal tumult. Further on rose the Savoy, the most magnificent palace of that age in the metropolis; and beyond St. Clement Danes the outer barrier of the city was approached, called Temple Bar, from its adjoining the splendid mansion of the Knights Templars.

Passing, not the present gateway, but only a bar, Fleet Street would be entered,—

'at this period not devoted to any particular trade, but abounding in shops, and surrounded by a populous neighbourhood; then passing on the right the noble convent of the White Friars, the visitor approached, not a broad street, but a river tolerably broad, and with a very rapid current, from which it derived its name, the Fleet, and which at this period was crowded with small vessels, laden chiefly with lime and charcoal, and bound to the wharfs, which extended as far as Battle Bridge, now called King's Cross. Crossing Fleet Bridge, he would now enter Ludgate Street, and passing on the right hand the large convent of Black Friars, whose fine gardens extended down to the Thames, he crossed the drawbridge that spanned the wide city ditch, and, passing under King Lud's Gate, entered the city. There the wide street of Ludgate opened to his view the west front of London's chief ornament, St. Paul's church. Quitting this noble structure, and passing along the churchyard, which was open for passengers during the day, the spectator would enter the West Chepe, a wide and almost triangular area, formed by the street now called Cheapside;

and a field named in old records the Crownstill, which seems to have extended along the southern side near the top, and also included a part of what is now called Paternoster Row. In the midst of this space stood the Standard, an ancient stone cross, and around it were stands, where the sellers of fish and vegetables, and the butchers from the neighbouring shambles, in blue frocks, and holding pole-axes, sold their wares; while the houses and shops that surrounded this market-place were inhabited by the goldsmiths, the pepperers, the mercers, and the linen-armourers. Although the shops were unglazed, and the expensive fittings-up of modern times unknown, still West Chepe, even at this period, is said to have presented a splendid appearance. Proceeding eastward along West Chepe, the handsome church of St. Mary-le-Bow appeared, and lower, on the opposite side, the chapel of St. Thomas of Acons. On the site of the present Mansion House was the Stocks Market, a smaller and inferior market to that of West Chepe; and beyond, Cornhill, for centuries the mart for clothing and household furniture, from the convenience of its situation to the braziers of Lothbury, the great manufacturers of kitchen utensils, and the tailors and linen-armourers of Coleman Street and the adjacent parts, the exclusive makers of both linen and woollen clothing; and Lombard Street, then the residence of foreign merchants. The line along Lombard Street and West Chepe was the chief road through the city, and on account of its width, its noble appearance, and the wealth of its inhabitants, it became the highway along which every procession to the tournament, to the coronation, or to the royal funeral, passed.—*The French Chronicle of London*. Introduction, pp. xii.—xiv.

There was a second and more ancient line of road through the city. It led along Old Fish Street, where, at the period we are treating of, the chief market for fish was held; then by Watheling Street, whose name denotes its Saxon origin, passing Tower Royal, then a fortress of considerable strength, into Candlewick Street, for so many centuries the residence of the wealthy drapers. On the south side of this street stood the famous London Stone, 'pitched upright near the chancel, and fixed in the ground very deep, fastened with bars of iron, and otherwise so strongly set, that if carts do run against it through negligence, the wheels be broken, and the stone itself unshaken.' This stone was highly valued by the citizens, and much ingenuity has been called forth to account for its origin and use. The most probable conjecture is, that it was a central *milliarium* or mile-stone, like that which stood in the Roman Forum, from which distances were reckoned. Its position in so prominent a place in the chief street of the Saxon capital strongly confirms this view. Beyond Candlewick or Cannon Street lay Eastcheap, the old Saxon market, and at a later period New Fish Street. The eastern part of the city was not then remarkable for trade. At its further extremity stood the Tower.

It is of course impossible within the limits of our space to give anything more than a cursory view of ancient London. The two thoroughfares which we have already described were the main arteries of the city; but the broad highway of the Thames was far more generally used than at the present day. It afforded the most natural means of communication between the palace at Westminster and the royal residence of the Tower; nor were the citizens, though generally well affected to the court, at all times so favourable as to make a passage through the city very agreeable. On one occasion they assembled on London Bridge, and pelted the Queen's barge as it endeavoured to pass through. Many of the nobility and the prelates too had their mansions on the river side; and the names of various benefactors are recorded who erected water-gates and stairs for convenience of embarkation. Billingsgate, fabled to have been erected by King Belinus, 400 years B.C., was among the first of a series of wharfs that lined the water side from the Tower to the Temple Gardens. Near the bridge, the stock-fishmongers had their dwellings. But the most largely used landing place was Queenhithe, where was a public granary for salt and corn.

A modern French author has complained that in London you can get nothing to eat in places where drink is sold, and *vice versâ*. That there were of old very curious restrictions upon publicans and keepers of eating-houses will be presently shown: but, if Fitz-Stephen is to be believed, the resources of the cooks of that age rivalled the monster establishment of the greatest Parisian *restaurant*.

'There is upon the river's bank a public place of cookery among the wines to be sold in the ships and in the wine-cellars. There every day ye may call for any dish of meat, roast, fried, or sodden; fish both small and great; ordinary flesh for the poorer sort, and more dainty for the rich, as venison and fowl. If friends come upon a sudden, wearied with travel, to a citizen's house, and they be loth to wait for curious preparations and dressings of fresh meat, let the servant give them water to wash and bread to stay their stomach, and in the mean time they run to the waterside, where all things that can be desired are at hand. *Whatsoever multitude of soldiers or other strangers enter into the city at any hour of the day or night, or else are about to depart*, they may turn in, bate here, and refresh themselves to their content, to avoid long fasting, and not go away without their dinner. If any desire to fit their dainty tooth, they take a goose; they need not to long for the fowl of Africa, no, nor the rare godwit of Ionia. This is the public cookery, and very convenient for the state of a city, and belongs to it. Hence it is that we read in Plato's *Gorgias*, that next to the physician's art is the trade of cooks, the

image and flattery of the fourth part of a city.'—*Stow*, vol. ii., appendix, p. 13.

It was long the practice for different trades to congregate together in special localities, and the convenience of this arrangement has caused it to be continued in wholesale branches to our own time. Of this many instances have been already noted. The space between Fleet Street and Holborn was inhabited chiefly by smiths and tanners; on each side of the river Fleet were the wharfs of the lime-burners, and dealers in charcoal and sea coal, which latter article was now coming into extensive use. On the site of Newgate Market there were butchers of yore, as there are now; scribes thronged the neighbourhood of Chancery Lane, and turners of beads held the ground now occupied by the booksellers in Paternoster Row. Little Britain takes its name from the mansion of the Duke of Britany, which stood just outside the gate: and from thence to the wide moor of Finsbury the numerous streets and alleys were filled with much such a motley crowd of the lower order of artificers, curriers, bowyers, and bowstring-makers,—although differing in the handicraft they exercised,—as are to be met with there at the present date.

Without one of the gates was a certain field, plain or smooth both in name and situation, 'Smithfield, or Smoothfield.' 'Every Friday, except some greater festival come in the way, there is a brave sight of gallant horses to be sold. Many come out of the city to buy or look on; to wit, earls, barons, knights, citizens, all resorting thither. It is a pleasant sight there to behold the nags, well fleshed, sleek, and shining delightfully, walking their feet on either side up and down by turns; or else trotting horses, which are more convenient to bear men-at-arms. When the coursers are ready to run their race, the people give a shout, and the common hackneys are commanded to go aside. In another part stand the country people with cattle and commodities of the field, large swine, and kine with udders stretching out, fair-bodied oxen, and the woolly flock. There are also cart horses, fit for the dray, or the plough, or the chariot; and some mares big with foal, and others that have their wanton colts following them close at their side.' It is long since there has been any 'pleasant sight' in Smithfield attended by earls and barons; but the horse market for the lowest kinds is still held on Friday, and probably has been unbrokenly handed down to us from Fitz-Stephen's age.

Strange as is the transformation from the city of the thirteenth century to the London of our day, the alteration in the appearance of the suburbs is yet more striking. To the west and north stretched large tracts of forest land, covering the ground on

which a large town has recently sprung up. Fields there were for pasture, 'and open meadows very pleasant, among which the river waters do flow, and the wheels of the mills are turned about with a delightful noise.' Game abounded in the woods, stags and lusty boars lurked in the thickets, and the citizens had the privilege by their charter of hunting in Middlesex, in Hertfordshire, in the Chilterns, and in Kent as far as the water of Cray. On the east was a succession of moors and green marshes, still testified by the names of Moorfields and Moorgate; the scene of much rough sport on the ice in the winter season, when tilting, and sliding, and skating with bones tied under the feet, and drawing one another at a rapid pace on seats formed of snow, were practised, 'not,' as our monkish friend tells us, 'without some hurt to their bodies.' At Westminster the royal palace stood on the water's edge, and near to it the abbey and convent were almost its only associated buildings. 'Then the hermitage of Charing, looking towards the noble mansion of the Archbishop of York, now Whitehall; and the leper-house of St. Giles, literally in the fields, and the simple church of St. Martin, with its equally appropriate title, and the meadow land and gentle slopes intersected by the rapid Fleet, which extended from St. Giles-in-the-fields to the elm trees on the western side of Smithfield.' Already had the Knights of St. John established themselves in a splendid mansion in Clerkenwell, and near to them stood a priory of nuns, founded in the twelfth century. The wide parish of Islington, which now contains upwards of a hundred thousand souls, was then a small village, called Iseldune, surrounded by forest land. Somewhat further to the east was the hamlet of Hochestone, or Hoxton, amid cornfields and windmills; then the moorlands of Finsburie, with the holy well of St. Agnes and its adjoining priory. Beyond this point, across some meadow lands, rose the grey tower of the church of Stibenhede (Stepney), 'while the massive heap of the Tower of London and the spire of St. Katharine's closed the view.'

Public buildings, in the modern sense of the term, there were none at this period, save the churches and ecclesiastical establishments; but in the number and splendour of these London shone conspicuous. Fitz-Stephen notes 'thirteen greater conventual churches, besides one hundred and twenty-six lesser parish churches;' and they largely increased as the century advanced. The very learned and elaborate Introduction of Archdeacon Hale to his edition of the *Domesday of St. Paul's*, published by the Camden Society, throws considerable light on the social condition of England in the first quarter of the fifteenth century, and enters minutely into the mutual relations of the various classes con-

nected with the 'agricultural interest.' We are compelled to limit ourselves to that portion of his book which illustrates the condition of the clergy of St. Paul's at the time embraced in our article.

The larger conventual establishments were already enriched with extensive property in land. No less than eighteen manors, scattered through four different counties, were held by St. Paul's chapter in the year 1222; and besides these there were twelve other prebends, two of which were as far distant as Bedfordshire. 'The rents of the prebends appear to have been always enjoyed separately by the prebendaries, and there seems little doubt that each prebend was in itself sufficiently valuable to render the great majority of the prebendaries indifferent as to obtaining that increase of their incomes which was afforded by residence at the cathedral.'*

To give some account of the mode of living of that cathedral body, will throw light upon the every-day life of a large class at this period. We will not enter upon any question of the tenure by which the churches held their lands: they were simply the lords of the manors in their possession, and a fixed rent was paid annually to them, partly in money and partly in kind. In these rents the thirty prebendaries, the vicars, the minor canons, and the servants of the church, all had their proportionate interest. It was a regularly graduated partnership, in which the highest and the lowest had a fixed share. The various manors included some 24,000 acres, of which three-eighths were in *demesne*, i. e., were the immediate property of the church; the remainder descended by inheritance amongst its holders, subject to certain rents and services.

The *Domesday of St. Paul's* admits us to a private view of the domestic economy of a large conventual establishment of that date. It was so arranged that each manor paid a portion of its rent in kind for the food of a single week, and also a weekly rent in money; the latter amounting to 40s. 7d., of which 6s. 8d. was for wood for the brewery and bakehouse, and 7d. for alms. The remaining £1. 13s. 4d. was distributed among the forty-nine persons who actually took part in the service of the cathedral. It is somewhat striking to observe that the principle of non-residence was already recognised, the prebendaries generally lived upon their prebends, and often farmed the manors under the chapter, and that they were commonly represented by vicars in the performance of their share of the duties at the cathedral.

* *Domesday of St. Paul's*, p. v.

But a much more curious picture is presented to modern eyes by the accounts of the revenue that was paid in kind. Every week there were delivered to the officers of the chapter about 13 quarters of wheat, 13 quarters of barley, and some $2\frac{1}{2}$ quarters of oats. 'On the west side of the street now called Godliman Street, stood the bakehouse; it was a large building, and its place is still identified by Paul's Bakehouse Yard. The brewery probably adjoined it. There was a mill for grinding the corn, worked by horses. There were four servants in the bakehouse, three in the brewery, and two at the mill, besides a clerk of the receipts. The brewery and bakehouse were under the charge of an officer, the *custos braciini*.' From documents it appears that in the year 1283 they baked at least five times in every fortnight, 28 bushels of wheat were ground for each baking, and on an average 290 loaves were produced. Each of the canons then received every day 156 ounces of bread. Nor was this enormous allowance of eatables unaccompanied by equivalent distributions of beverage. Twice in each week 79 bushels of grain, mingled wheat, oats, and barley, were converted into beer, and produced enough liquor to admit of thirty gallons a week being assigned to each of the thirty canons, besides allotments more or less liberal to a large number of dependents and hangers on. It is amusing in the detailed account we have received of the distribution of 40,463 loaves in the year 1283, to find that whilst the 30 canons had 32,760 for their share, the magnificent number of *sixteen* was apportioned 'for the coopers, the infirm, minute pittances, and other matters,' and two loaves at the installation of two canons; and that of 67,814 gallons that were brewed, *four* were apportioned *to the infirm in villd*. Let us hope that capitular bodies then and since have been more liberal in their individual than in their corporate capacity.

What became of all these mountains of bread and barrels of beer? Whether the good brethren sold their surplus quantities, or dispensed them in hospitality to their friends and strangers; whether the daily alms at the convent-gate were furnished from the individual shares of its members, or were merely the fragments that were left after the common meals;—on such questions we look in vain for information from the *Domesday of St. Paul's*. Thus much, however, is evident, that in the very heart of the metropolis were a large body of clergy, whose substantial wealth gave them a commanding position amongst a commercial community in which pecuniary standing is always acknowledged. We have direct evidence that the distribution at St. Paul's was larger than that of the other religious houses; at least, the loaf of the St. Paul's canons exceeded that of the canons regular of

the Holy Trinity and others. These, too, had their revenues partly paid in kind; and the carriage of so large an amount of provisions weekly to the metropolis must have necessitated intercourse with many parts of the country, and have had a direct tendency to encourage trade.

The same must have been the effect of the munificence of Henry III., who reigned for more than half of this century. Never sat monarch on the English throne—save, perhaps, George IV.—who delighted so much in building, or was so great a patron and student of architecture. This King's writs direct the sheriffs to repair 'his houses' in the castles of almost every county of England, and enter into the minutest detail as to the method in which the improvements are to be carried out, the persons to be employed, and the wages to be paid. In his reign the old castles assumed a more domestic character: the keep was abandoned for a spacious hall and chambers; and, as necessity required, buildings of wood and plaster were erected within the *enceinte* of the walls. 'These buildings were frequently connected by covered passages, built of wood, sometimes open at the sides, but more frequently quite weather-proof, so that the Queen might walk from her chamber to chapel *with a dry foot*.'

We have the details of the preparations made at Westminster for the coronation of Edward III., in 1273, given to us in the *Liber de antiquis Legibus*, a translation of which we subjoin:—

'All the vacant ground that was within the enclosure of the palace at Westminster was so magnificently covered over with buildings and offices, that no part of it remained unoccupied. On the south side of the old palace there were constructed many halls, as many as could be built there, in which were set up tables, firmly fixed in the ground, at which tables the magnates and princes and nobles were to be entertained on the day of the coronation and fifteen days thereafter; so that all, both rich and poor, who come to the solemnity of the coronation, may be received gratuitously, and none be sent away.

'Innumerable kitchens, also, were built within the said enclosure, in which victuals should be prepared against the said solemnity; and, lest those kitchens should not suffice for the victuals to be prepared in them, there were placed outside the kitchens numberless leaden cauldrons, in which meat should be cooked. And be it remembered that the great kitchen, in which fowls and other things were to be cooked, was wholly uncovered at the top, so that all manner of smoke might escape.

'With regard to the other utensils necessary for the sustentation of so great a court, no one can describe them in writing. No one can enumerate the casks of wine that were provided on this occasion.

'And, in short, never, on any previous occasion, was there prepared

so vast an abundance of delicacies, and of all the good things that belong to the maintenance of the most noble court.

'The great and small halls were newly whitewashed and painted; and if anything within the enclosures of the palace of the lord the King was broken or impaired by age, it was put into good condition.'* — *Liber de Antiquis Legibus*, pp. 172, 173.

The practice of whitewashing here alluded to, seems to have been a common one at this early period. In the extracts from the Liberate Rolls of Henry III., there is frequent allusion to it,—a proof that it is no special abomination of modern times. Thus, in the twenty-fourth of Henry III., we read: 'The King to the keepers of the works of the Tower of London: We command you to cause the chamber of our Queen to be whitened internally, and newly painted with roses.....also cause our great chamber in the same Tower to be entirely whitewashed and newly painted.' And in the following year the same persons are ordered 'to repair the granary within the same Tower, and to cause all the leaden gutters of the great tower, through which rain-water should fall from the summit of the same tower, to be carried down to the ground; so that the walls of the said tower, which has been newly whitewashed, may be in nowise injured by the dropping of rain-water, or be easily weakened.....And also whitewash the whole chapel of St. John the Evangelist in the same Tower ...And whitewash all the old wall around our aforesaid Tower.'†

But we will leave these special purlieus of royalty, and elbow our way among the common crowd in the city, that we may gather what we can of the every-day life of the great mass of the people: how they were fed and housed, in what way and under what conditions they transacted business one with another, how they were ruled in their municipal character, and how they bore themselves towards those in power. It should be remembered, in the course of this rapid sketch, that the results arrived at are not solely applicable to the period we have selected. Society had not, as yet, acquired that impetus of rapid progress which is the characteristic of modern times, and the state of social and civic life in the days of Henry III., or the early part of Edward I., is almost identical with that of more than a century later.

The street architecture of this period was not of an exalted character. The houses consisted of a ground-floor and one story above it; the walls being some sixteen feet high, from which sprang a high pitched roof, with its gable facing the street. In

* Also quoted by Turner, pp. 65, 66.

† H. Turner, pp. 194, 197, 198.

consequence of frequent devastations by fire, the assize of Fitz-Alwyn, at the close of the twelfth century, ordained that all party-walls should be built of stone. But the frame-work rising from the party-wall and the gables was of wood, plastered over, and commonly whitewashed. The lower room was about eight feet high; the upper one, commonly called *the solar*, had probably the advantage of being open to the lofty roof. Along the wall gutters were laid to carry off the water into an open kennel; and strict regulations guided the disposition of all sanitary arrangements. When other stories were added is unknown; but it appears that at first they were separate tenements, entered by stairs outside the dwelling; and so much altercation ensued between the owners as to call for a stringent royal mandate, enjoining each owner to keep his own portion in proper repair. Glass windows were at present far from common; their place was supplied by apertures, closed at pleasure by wooden shutters. Chimneys were only to be found in the dwellings of the wealthiest class. Even royal kitchens, as we have seen, were uncovered, that all manner of smoke might escape. In the homes of the middle and lower classes it found its way out of the doors and windows, as best it could. When chimneys became more general, which they did towards the close of the century, they were to be faced with plaster, tiles, or stone; and the scavengers of the city, on entering upon their office, took oath that they would see that 'all chimneys, ovens, and rere-closets are made of stone, and sufficiently protected against the peril of fire.' Wooden partitions, lath-work, or boards, were not to be erected too near to them; 'and, in case of contravention thereof, the scavenger was to remove the same, exacting fourpence from the offender for his trouble.'

Beneath the ground-floor there were cellars, which were commonly used as places of business, and were entered from the street by steps that often encroached seriously on the pavement. Stalls, on which goods were exposed for sale, projected into the street to the legal width of two feet and a half. 'These were to be moveable or flexible, according to the discretion of the alderman of the ward, and according as the streets are wide or narrow;' whilst pent-houses, which were to be nine feet high at least, 'so as to allow of people riding beneath,' were carried out beyond the width of the footpath, and no doubt brought opposite neighbours into very close quarters with one another. A high wooden footpath, raised above the level of the road; open cellars, occupied by various citizens; open stalls, with goods exhibited, and the owners or their apprentices standing and loudly inviting the custom of passers by; and the overhanging pentices stretching

athwart the vista; these must have formed the chief features of street architecture in Henry the Third's reign.

The frail nature of these dwellings may be learned from an enactment of so late a date as the days of Edward III., by which it was ordered that occupiers, 'between the Feasts of Whitsuntide and of St. Bartholomew, in consequence of the excessive drought, should keep a barrel or large earthen vessel full of water before the house for the purpose of quenching fire. For the more speedy removal, also, of burning houses, each ward was enjoined to provide a strong iron crook with a wooden handle, two chains, and two strong cords; these to be left in possession of the bedel of the ward, who was also to be provided with a good horn, "loudly sounding."'* In some cases, on the death of a house-proprietor, his widow claimed her free-bench, as it was termed, in the house of her late husband; and instances are quoted in which the sheriffs put her in possession of a portion of the building, assigning a chamber and cellar for her use, with a right to share in the kitchen, stable, and court-yard. We wonder what some modern brides would say at thus having a mother-in-law forced upon them; nor can anything be well imagined more likely to lead to family broils. The arrangement shows the existence of a considerable mansion (in the case quoted) in so uninviting a locality as 'Styngkyng Lane.' A married woman had, besides, special privileges in the City; could rent and open a shop there on her own account, and be solely liable for the rent thereof; could pursue any trade or craft; and, if her husband took no part in it, could be regarded as a *femme sole* in all things touching it, and could be committed to prison in default of payment, her husband being in person and property untouched. These are advantages which we commend to the attention of the active promoters of woman's rights.

We cannot leave this branch of the subject without some reference to the wages of artisans employed in buildings, then regulated by statute,—carpenters, masons, plasterers, tilers, and daubers. The latter class, who filled up the timber frame-works of gables with mud-clay mixed with straw, received fourpence a day, or else three-halfpence and 'mete silver,' at the option of their employer, between Michaelmas and Martinmas, and between Purification and Easter; at the other periods the sum was alternately reduced to threepence and raised to fivepence. 'Saturdays and vigils were to be paid for as whole days,' the men leaving off work at about four o'clock; whilst on Sundays and fast-days they did not work at all. This was the remuneration

* *Liber Albus*, p. xxxiv.

ration of skilled artisans, their servants receiving from twopence to threepence for all demands. 'Should any person pay a workman beyond these rates, he was to pay to the city a fine of forty shillings, and the workman to be subjected to forty days' imprisonment.' These sums must be multiplied by fifteen, to make them equivalent to the present value of money; so that the then rate of wages was sufficiently liberal.

The police regulations for keeping the streets and lanes in a cleanly condition were very stringent. The highways were to be kept free from dirt and every species of refuse; and each householder was to clear the dirt from before his own door, 'and not sweep it before his neighbour's.' Neither water nor anything else was to be thrown out of the windows, but to be carried down stairs, and poured into the kennel,—an enactment sadly needing to be enforced in many continental towns even now. Furriers and skimmers were forbidden to scour their furs in the streets by day, but might do so by night: whilst fishmongers were on no account to throw their dirty water into the street, but to have it carried to the Thames,—a singular exception to the great precautions taken to preserve the purity of that river. The duty of cleansing the public ways did not devolve upon the 'scavengers,' but on the 'rakers:' the former superintended the building of houses and the *maintenance* of the highways and pavements; the latter removed all the refuse to places provided for its reception.

There were a number of curious enactments as to swine within the city. At one time all persons were allowed to keep pigs 'within their houses.' Then the privilege of associating with such inmates was confined to the bakers; and, by a later ordinance, it was decided that 'pigs and oxen should on no account be reared in houses within the city.' Pigs found roaming about the streets were liable to be seized and killed by the finder, and could only be redeemed by the rightful owner on payment of a fixed sum. Yet it was deemed necessary, in the early part of Edward the First's reign, to have four men, 'chosen and sworn, to take and kill all swine found wandering within the walls of the city, to whomsoever they might belong.' An exception, however, was made in favour of the reuter of the Hospital of St. Anthony, the patron saint of swine: but presently we learn that he is obliged to take oath 'that he will not avow any swine found at large in the city, nor will he hang any bells round their necks,' (this was the distinguishing mark of the pigs of St. Anthony's,) 'but only around those pigs which have been given them in pure alms.' The temptation to claim a pig which would have been forfeited by any other owner, was doubtless a severe strain upon

the conscience of the renter. It was equally contrary to law for dogs to wander about, either by day or night, without some one to look after them; but here, too, an exception was made in favour of 'genteel dogs,' (*chiens gentils*,) the property of the great lords of the land.

Judging from the complaints met with in Juvenal, the problem of forming a pavement which shall be tolerable under the influence of much traffic, is one of the latest which civilization has learned to solve. All accounts agree in representing the roads and streets of by-gone centuries as almost impassable, save in dry weather. There seems to have been no means discovered between the laying down of large square blocks of stone, or the pavements of the old Roman roads, and an utterly abominable roadway. In the city, every householder was ordered to keep good the footpath before his own door, and on no account to pave higher or lower than his neighbour. For maintaining the middle of the streets in good repair, a toll, known as 'pavage,' was exacted on horses and carriages at the city gates. Considering the difference in the value of money, this appears to us to be enormous.

'A cart on entering the city or going forth shall pay for pavage one penny; a laden horse, one farthing; a cart that brings sand and potter's clay, threepence per week; and carts with corn and flour from Stratford, threepence per week; carts with firewood on sale shall pay one farthing; and with charcoal on sale, one penny. But carts and horses of the great and of others, which bring their victuals, or other goods for their use, and for consumption in their homes, shall pay nothing. To prevent the streets and roads being unnecessarily cut up by carts, it was ordered, *temp.* Edward I., that no cart serving the city with wood, sand, or stone, should be shod with iron, (*ferramenta*) meaning, probably, as to the strakes or rims of the wheels. The length and probably the breadth of these strakes was also strictly regulated; and we find instances mentioned of blacksmiths getting into trouble for not making them of sufficient length; the circumference of the wheel being divided probably into a number of segments, each of a certain regulated length. These blacksmiths are spoken of as living without the walls, and bringing in the strakes for sale.'—*Liber Albus*, pp. xliii., xliv.

In various districts of the city large open spaces were paved with rough layers of stones, and formed the sites of the different markets. In Cheapside and Cornhill, the vendors of 'bread, cheese, poultry, fruit, hides, onions, garlic, and other small wares, stood in the main road between the kennels.' At the Graschirche, and before the convent of the Friars Minors in Newgate, they occupied the broad pavements just alluded to, and sold their goods in the open air. At other places permanent

stalls were erected for their convenience, as at the market of St. Nicholas Flesh Shambles, and in 'Stokkes' Market on the site of the present Mansion House: in these, butchers and fishmongers alternately exposed their goods on their appropriate days. The ground adjoining the churchyard or 'haw' of St. Mary Woolchurch was devoted to the dealers in wool, and at a later period stands were let near the 'Brokyncross,' and around the Cross in Cheap. Under some of the city gates, too, stalls were erected, and hired out for purposes of merchandise.

Every precaution was taken to prevent brawls arising in the streets, or the occurrence of accidents. Carts which were unladen were not to proceed faster than loaded vehicles. Weapons were not allowed to be worn in the city after ringing of curfew, and hotel keepers were strictly enjoined to acquaint all strangers of this regulation, that they might not disregard it unwittingly. Disobedience to this order was punished by the immediate removal of the offender to a prison in Cornhill, called 'the Tun.' There is an account of an unlucky chaplain, who was taken to the Tun for wandering about at night, and then was sentenced to a term of imprisonment for being found unlawfully in possession of arms. Women of light character were carried off to the same place of confinement, and even persons of known reputation were enjoined after dark to be accompanied by a lanthorn. The whole spirit of these regulations was in accordance with the views lately expressed by some of the magistrates of modern Rome.

We meet with frequent mention of evil-disposed persons, who congregated in certain localities, generally in the neighbourhood of some large convent, and rendered the immediate district insecure after dark. It does not, for the most part, appear very clearly, whether suspicion fell upon persons actually connected with the ecclesiastic establishments, or whether they resided in such vicinities in order to avail themselves of the privileges of sanctuary. That thieves might have less chances of escape, strong chains and barriers were placed across the streets, especially near the Fleet Prison. Watch and ward was to be kept by each alderman and the men of his ward by night, the civic dignitary having to keep three horses for the purpose. A sergeant-at-arms watched each of the gates at night, supported by the citizens and some armed soldiers.

The police regulations connected with the river were clearly laid down. No one was to forestall goods brought by ship into the port of the Thames. 'No boat or ship was to moor anywhere at night except at Billingsgate and Queen Hythe; nor was it to moor off the bankside of Southwark, under penalty of

imprisonment of the parties so offending, and loss of the vessel.' A peculiar jealousy of Southwark may be traced through all the records of the city legislation. Every possible hindrance was put upon the extension of its trade, every endeavour was made to transfer to its boundaries any objectionable inhabitants and unseemly occupations; a determination was formed to regard all its rising efforts with an evil eye, to suspect any passengers that left it for the London side after dark as thieves and malefactors, and to abridge in every possible way any advantages it would be likely to reap from its vicinity to the metropolis. It is not easy to trace the origin of this hostility, but it is not unlikely that it may have been the resort of a large number of what would now be termed 'the dangerous classes,' who were driven by the vigilance of the city authorities beyond the boundaries of their immediate jurisdiction.

Instead of its being the vast sewer which it has become through the wise arrangements of modern times, our ancestors took special pains to preserve the purity of the Thames. 'It was forbidden to cast into it dung, sand, rubbish, or filth;' butchers were not permitted to carry their offal to it, but were to bury it in a place appointed for the purpose. All boats to be laden with hay, straw, or rushes, were not to take their articles on board until immediately before their departure; and for every such cargo landed at the wharf, a toll of tweldepence was exacting for cleansing the place where it was unloaden. All dwellers along the course of the Walbrook stream were to keep a rake, 'the better to intercept any refuse thrown into it.' The conservancy of the Thames was already vested by charter in the corporation of the city.

Under the head of police regulations a vast amount of miscellaneous information may be gathered from the *Liber Albus*. There are enactments respecting those who took refuge in sanctuary, concerning Jews, lepers, courtesans, beggars, fencing masters, old-clothes dealers, and others. If a criminal escaped to a sanctuary, he was to be watched by the neighbours, whose ward was liable to a fine of one hundred shillings, if he got off free without surrendering or abjuring the country. A circumstance connected with the privilege of sanctuary led to one of the most serious offences of this period. The story is recorded by Stow.

'In the year 1284, Laurence Ducket, goldsmith, having grievously wounded one Ralph Aspin in West Cheape, fled into Bow church; into the which (in the night time) entered certain evil persons, friends unto the said Ralph, and slew the said Laurence, lying in the steeple, and then hanged him up; placing him so by the window, as

if he had hanged himself, and so was it found by inquisition. For the which fact, Laurence Ducket, being drawn by the feet, was buried in a ditch without the city. But shortly after (by relation of a boy who lay with the said Laurence at the time of his death, and had hid him there for fear) the truth of the matter was disclosed. For the which cause, Jordan Goodcheape, Ralph Aspin, Gilbert Clarke, and Geoffrey Clarke were attainted, and a certain woman, named Alice, that was chief causer of the said mischief, was burned; and to the number of sixteen men were drawn and hanged; besides others, that being richer, after long imprisonment, *were hanged by the purse*. The church was interdicted, the doors and windows were stopped up with thorns; but Laurence was taken up and honestly buried in the churchyard.—Book iii., p. 20.

We must refer our readers to a more general history of the period for a detailed description of the wrongs inflicted upon the Jews. At one time they were indiscriminately plundered; at another heavy fines were inflicted on the Jews in London, because their fellow-countrymen at Norwich were accused of certain crimes; they were confined to a particular locality in the metropolis, as in most continental towns at a later period; they were subjected to peculiar imposts, and these followed them to the grave; for a tax of threepence was levied on the body of every Jew buried in London. In 1262, they were barbarously massacred in London, 'under the plea, real or pretended,' that one of their body had extorted from a Christian more than the legal rate of interest. Upwards of five hundred were put to death, and their houses and synagogues destroyed. During the reign of Edward I., they were not only imprisoned and extortionately 'squeezed' as before, 'but the slightest defalcation of talliage, which was now levied on children as well as their parents, was punished by banishment. The defaulter in these cases was to appear at Dover, before the expiration of three days, prepared to leave the country.' In the third year of Edward the First's reign they were placed by statute in a better condition; but popular hatred was soon directed against them. A general suspicion falling upon them of being guilty of adulterating and clipping the coin, 'every Jew was seized in one day, viz., 17th of November, 1279; and, after full conviction, two hundred and eighty of them, both men and women, together with three Christians, received sentence of death, and were executed at London without mercy, besides great numbers in other parts. This was but a prelude to their final banishment in 1290. The King seized upon all real estates of the Jews in the kingdom, and banished the whole community for ever.'*

* *The French Chronicle of London*, p. 16, note.

The civic regulations of the thirteenth and following century, in reference to trades, seem to have been framed with the express purpose of horrifying modern free-traders. Petty enactments interfere with every item of commerce, and make their untoward influence tell through every stage of mercantile operations. No one was to go out of the city to buy corn, cattle, bread, or any article of merchandise, in Southwark. Butchers were not to expose blood in their windows, nor to follow their callings on Sundays. Bowyers were not to send bows for sale to Cornhill, nor to any other place within the city. Artisans were not to have the liberty of refusing work, where offered statutable wages, and might be arrested and imprisoned on failing to comply. Saddlers, skimmers, tanners, fishmongers, poultrymen, and other *operarii* were to be chastised for charging excessively, and were to take no more than they used to take. The laws fixed the price of common spurs at eightpence and sixpence the pair, the best not to exceed twelvepence. Shoeing smiths were to have three-halfpence for putting on horse shoes with six nails, and twopence with eight nails; with some other modifications according to the quality and use of the animal. Those who let out horses and carts for hire were at any time liable to be called upon to furnish cartage and carriage for the city. Goldsmiths were compelled to put a stamp on their plate, sword and knife makers to have a private mark on their wares. The baker was interfered with in the manufacture of bread, the brewer in the selection of water for his beer, and the washer-woman in the shape of her tub.

Many and minute were the rules laid down for the guidance of 'hostelers' and 'herbergeours;' the former of whom, it is supposed, both lodged and boarded the horses and servants of their guests, which the latter did not. Cooks sold provisions, as noted above, at their own houses, and strangers resorted thither. Foreigners were rarely permitted to keep hotels; and then, with characteristic jealousy, were to have 'houses in the heart of the city,' and were excluded from the favourite locality for this trade on the Thames bank. Hotel keepers were bound, by the old Saxon law of frank-pledge, to be answerable for the misconduct of any guest who remained at their house more than twenty-four hours. They were to take the arms of guests under their charge until their departure, to warn them not to carry weapons after curfew had rung, and to take care and be home in good time. The landlord, if a broker, might not entertain merchants who dealt in the same class of goods; nor be allowed to make his own bread and beer, but must buy it of baker or brewer; and, when bought, he must not sell it, save to *bond fide*

guests; and he was liable to a visit from the bedel and constables, to see that this rule was not transgressed. The price at which he should supply oats and hay was fixed for him,—at rates sufficiently remunerative, it must be allowed. The charge for a night's lodging in Henry the Fourth's time was one penny. By special charters the citizens were freed from liability to have any of the royal retinue billeted upon them.

The brewing interest, now powerful enough to influence the Budget of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, was then avowedly in low esteem, (*de vile juggedment*), and mainly in the hands of females. The advocates of the Maine Law might find abundant precedent in the spirit of mediæval legislation, but none at all in the letter thereof. Drunkenness is not once mentioned, it was probably deemed too trivial to call for interference. A quart was the smallest quantity sold; but the editor of the *Liber Albus* supposes that as it was drunk quite new, it was unlikely to cause inebriety. The ale-house was distinct from the wine-house, and breweress and ale-wife alike were the objects of the government's paternal care. No sooner was a brewery open than the ale-conner was summoned to taste its quality. If he considered it not equal to the assize, or 'under proof,' in modern language, he set on it a lower price, which could not be exceeded, save at the risk of the pillory. Gallon, pottle, quart, and vat were all alike to be impressed with the aldermanic seal. Private customers sent their vessels to the brewery, which, after standing there all night, that the ale might have time to work, on being taken away next morning were to be 'full of good and clear ale.' Brewers and ale-wives were not to keep their doors open after curfew, under heavy penalties, and were to charge three farthings a gallon, 'and no more.'

The sale of sweet wines was a monopoly; only three shops being allowed in the city. The price of the wine was fixed, as well as the measure by which it was sold; different kinds were not to be mixed, and the customer was entitled to see it drawn from the cask; like the beer, it was to be 'conned,' and duly gaged by officers appointed for the purpose. That evil-disposed persons might have no place of resort by night, the wine-shops were to be shut when curfew rang. These shops were distinguished by a long pole with a sign, or a bunch of leaves at the end; whence the proverb, 'Good wine needs no bush.'

The inquisitorial spirit of the time entered quite microscopically into matters connected with the manufacture and sale of bread; the universal necessity of the article being deemed a reason for special directions concerning it. Some of the bread consumed in the city was brought from Stratford, Bromley,

Stepney, and St. Albans; it was regarded, however, with much jealousy by the hallmote of bakers, and with the permission for its sale (which was at times withheld) they declared that they esteemed it spurious. Bread from Southwark was more than once excluded by name, 'because its bakers are not amenable to the justice of the city.' Loaves were to be made at two and four a penny, and some were to be charged at a higher price; they were to be impressed with the seal of the maker, of the impress of which the alderman was to keep a counterpart; they were not to be fine without and coarse within, or to be composed of mingled wheat and bran; and bread of inferior leaven was ordered to be *fait cribre*,—an unintelligible injunction to modern readers. Bakers were not to sell except in open market, nor even to knead their dough without being accessible to the servants of substantial people. The baker of *toaste* (probably 'brown') bread was on no account to make white, and *vice versâ*; nor even to possess a bolter, his bread being made of unbolted meal; nor to sell his flour to a cook, lest the latter should make his paste of this inferior article. But we shall weary the reader with these petty enactments. The price of the article wholesale to the hucksters, the perquisites which might or might not be given, the spot in which the sales might be made, the materials with which the oven should be heated, the water to be employed in kneading, the conditions under which credit might be allowed, the instructions to be afforded to their servants 'twice in the year,' the weapons they might carry, the hours at which they might purchase corn; all these are laid down, and they do not exhaust the list of regulations. Light weight, interference with the servants and customers of rival tradesmen, and private arrangements between corn-dealers and owners of ovens to share in the bakers' profits, were held in special disfavour. Horse-bread, pastry, pie-baking, and pie-making, were also the subject of regulations.

Nor were the vendors and grinders of corn allowed much greater freedom. 'It was forbidden to sell corn by the sample, or to put it in any place out of public view. No monger or regrator of fish, corn, or poultry was to make purchase thereof before the hour of prime.* Good corn was not to be mixed with bad, "in deceit of the people," under pain of forfeiture.† Fish of many kinds—above thirty different species are named in the *Liber Albus*—was more commonly used by the lower orders in London than at the present day. This, no doubt, was partly

* This was rung at St. Paul's at six o'clock in the morning.

† *Liber Albus*, p. lxxiii.

owing to the rigidity with which the Romish fast-days were observed. The sale of each of the different kinds of fish was regulated by enactments peculiar to itself: these enjoined the size of the measure to be used, the number that might be sold together, the hours of market, the price, and other minutiae of the trade. Boats with oysters, whelks, mussels, and soles, 'were only to stay, for the purpose of sale, two ebbs and a flood: the fish to be forfeited in case of breach thereof.' Another equally curious regulation was a royal ordinance, in existence so early as the times of Henry III., that 'the first boat in the season with fresh herrings from Yarmouth should pay double custom at the quay.' It would have been far more sensible to enjoin that it should pay no custom at all.

Butchers, poulterers, hucksters, pepperers, shoemakers, clothiers, tailors, fripperers, farriers, skimmers, dyers, and a long list of others, had their business marked out for them in the same spirit. It was no easy matter to operate upon the market in those days, nor was a man free to withdraw from any occupation because it had been damaged by such ordinances, without incurring serious disabilities. In the sale of goods the requirements of royalty were to override every other consideration, and after them the nobles and great lords were to have their pick of the market, before the vulgar had a chance of making purchases. Yet, despite these obstacles, a very large amount of business was transacted in London. Its trade was famous throughout Europe, and the merchants of Flanders, Germany, France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, and Bavaria, are named as holding commercial relations with the citizens. Liberties were granted by charter to those of Douay, Malines, and St. Omer: as also allocations to the townsmen of Dublin and Cork. The Haunse merchants had a special guild; and several of the city companies can trace their existence back to this period, although their charters have a more recent date. Large fortunes were amassed by commerce; and so far back as the year 1189, we find Henry Fitz Aylwin of London stone, the first Mayor of London, the lord of several manors, and a person of no small influence. The necessities of our warlike princes brought them into contact with the moneyed men of their day, caused mutual ties between the city and the court, and led to many of those alliances between nobility and wealth which have exercised so great an influence on our social condition.

A list of prices, six hundred years ago, presents many interesting features: some of these have been already mentioned, but we will give a few more specimens, gathered somewhat miscellaneously together. Herrings were to be sold at 6s. a thousand, the

best stock-fish for $1\frac{1}{2}d.$, and a cod for sixpence. Lambs were not to be more than $6d.$; the best ox, $13s. 4d.$; the best cow, $10s.$; the best pig, $4s.$; and the best sheep, $2s.$ Eggs were $8d.$ a hundred, (the hundred numbering 120;) hens, $3d.$ each; rabbits, $4d.$, and a penny more for the skin, if sold with it; partridges, $3d.$; plovers, $2d.$; and eight larks, $1d.$ Somewhat later, hens had risen to $6d.$, and the same price was to be charged for geese, capons, purcells, curlews, and a dozen of thrushes. With the near recollection of weekly bills just now recurring in a London season, we cannot help wishing that poulterers for about three months might be compelled to supply us at such prices, or to send us spring chickens at $2d.$ each, ducks at $2\frac{1}{2}d.$, woodcocks at $3d.$, pheasants at $12d.$, cygnets at $4d.$, herons at $16d.$, bitterns at $18d.$, and a dozen pigeons for $8d.$ A robe from the tailor, garnished with silks, cost $18d.$; a man's robe, garnished with thread and buckram, $14d.$; a coat and hood, $10d.$ Tailors made garments for both sexes, and might charge $2s. 6d.$ for a lady's long dress, adorned with silk and cendale, and $4d.$ more for a pair of sleeves for *changing*. Furs were much worn then as now; but we hand over their names to be distinguished by our readers, despairing ourselves of any satisfactory result. Skinners were to have $5s. 6d.$ for preparing a thousand skins of *stranlyng*, *polayne*, and 'other black work,' and $4s. 6d.$ for a thousand of *roskyn*, $1s.$ for a hundred English coney-skins, and $7d.$ for one hundred *scrympyns*, and no more. You might in those days purchase a pair of cordwain shoes for $6d.$, of cow leather ditto for $5d.$; whilst a pair of boots of the former material rose to $3s. 6d.$, and of the latter to $3s.$ The best sheepskin gloves were $2d.$ a pair. The ingenuity of modern dressmakers, in summing up bills for trimming and other elegancies, would have been liable to stern checks from the sumptuary laws; and we read of a girdler getting into trouble for 'harnessing a girdle with silver.'

It is obvious to remark that these petty restrictions failed to effect their object. Despite all the precautions that were taken, fraudulent dealing and adulteration of goods were common then as now; the universal suspicion that prevailed seems to have been justified by the discovery of shortcomings of the suspected parties. Laws in all ages have failed to alter human nature. Whenever the hope of gain overcomes the power of principle, or the chances of detection seem less than those of profit, legislative enactments are found inefficacious. And the costume of the English was never more extravagant than during the period when sumptuary laws were in force.

But it might be argued that the social life of a people whose every-day transactions with one another were so hampered, must

have been very wretched, or, at the least, very inconvenient. It were folly to deny the prejudicial results that must have sprung from so much authoritative interference; we have learned by our own happy experience the advantages of unrestricted commerce. But it is far easier thus to judge *ab extra* of individual legislative acts, or of the whole spirit of the legislation of a period, than it is to realize the whole life of a nation which had never known another state of things, and whose own modes of thought were in accordance with the customs of their times. We believe that the various regulations, of which we have given so many examples, were demanded by the mass of the people, and were regarded as necessary for their protection. In criticizing such a period, we should remember that but few years have passed since the most absurd decrees have been removed from our statute-book; and that, contemporaneously with the existence of the Code Napoleon, and, indeed, until some few months ago, the prices of the staple articles of food were arranged by authority in the city of Paris.

But we need not dwell exclusively on any such line of argument. We have more positive proof that the old city of London was inhabited by a happy and contented people. Its annals are unstained by the *émeutes*, by the risings of a starved and outraged population, or by any of those scenes of violence, which are met with in the history of continental states. In the wars between King and nobles the city had been occasionally involved: it was too powerful not to be earnestly solicited by both parties, and too rich not to excite their cupidity. But old Stow records, with honest pride, that in its history there were very few incidents that could be quoted to show that it was tumultuous or ill-disposed. On two or three occasions the city lost its privileges, but rather owing to the rapacity which extorted a sum of money for their renewal, than from any crimes which demanded such a penalty. Yet they were no craven and submissive race. Early in the thirteenth century we find St. Paul's Cross a place of public meeting. Thither assembled all the freemen in deliberation on municipal and other important matters, and a voice seems to have been freely accorded to those who had injuries to complain of or injustice to withstand. Punishment, swift and stern, in many cases well calculated to bring the offender into merited contempt, followed upon conviction of petty misdeeds. With a spirit of fairness hardly to have been expected in a jealous age, the aldermen were enjoined to hold daily courts, that if any foreigner had reason to give information against a citizen, he might not be unduly detained in England. We love

to believe that the minds of our ancestors, if somewhat narrow, were yet scrupulously just.

How bold a spirit prevailed may be gathered from the fact that when, in violation of a special item of their liberties, the King's purveyor tried to billet his attendants on the citizens, and seized upon the house of the sheriff for that purpose, the latter functionary withstood the attempt, rubbed out the marks by which houses had been denoted for such an use, and successfully maintained, before the proper tribunal, his resistance to the usurpation. In the councils of the sovereign, plain words were spoken, and stern defiance often uttered, in reply to tyrannical demands. Strong in their mutual association, in the supplies which they afforded to the wants of the King's exchequer, in the support which they were sure to receive from some one of the great parties in the State, and, above all, in the sturdy spirit that led them to court danger in sport, that (as Fitz-Stephen says) they might be ready to meet it in reality, they were never regarded as a mere rabble; and to have spoken of them as some of the French Kings spoke of the citizens beneath their sway, might have cost the Monarch a sharp struggle for his crown. We cannot help thinking that the editor of the *Liber Albus* has dwelt too long upon the minutiae of the volumes, that he has failed to take a sufficiently broad estimate of the period; and we are far from believing that the dark picture which he has drawn is a true portrait of the past. 'Trifles make life;' but the irritation produced by trifles depends almost entirely upon the disposition and mind of the individual; and arrangements which are to us intolerable commend themselves to the judgment of other lands and times.

- ART. IV.—1. *The Limits of Religious Thought examined, in Eight Lectures, preached before the University of Oxford in the Year 1858.* [The Bampton Lecture.] By H. L. MANSEL, B.D., [LL.D., Edinburgh,] Reader in Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy at Magdalen College, Tutor and late Fellow of St. John's College, [Oxon.] Fourth Edition. London: Murray. 1859.
2. *What is Revelation? Sermons on the Epiphany, and Letters to a Student of Theology on the Bampton Lectures of Mr. Mansel.* By F. D. MAURICE, M.A. Macmillans. 1859.
3. *A Letter to the Rev. F. D. Maurice, &c.* By the Rev. C. P. CHRETIEN, M.A. Parkers. 1859.
4. *An Examination of the Rev. F. D. Maurice's Strictures, &c.* By the LECTURER. 1859.

5. *Sequel to the Inquiry, What is Revelation? In a Series of Letters to a Friend. Containing a Reply, &c.* By F. D. MAURICE. Macmillans. 1860.
6. *The Method of the Divine Government, Physical and Moral.* By JAMES M'COSH, LL.D., &c. Sixth Edition. Edinburgh: Sutherland and Co.; London: Simpkins. 1859.
7. *The Intuitions of the Mind inductively investigated.* By the REV. JAMES M'COSH, LL.D., &c. London: Murray. 1860.
8. *The Province of Reason: a Criticism of the Bampton Lecture, &c.* By JOHN YOUNG, LL.D., Edinburgh, Author of 'The Christ of History,' 'The Mystery—Evil and Good,' &c. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1860.

THE commotion excited by the Bampton Lectures of 1858 does not seem likely to subside very soon. The controversy on their merits has not spent itself, and will leave enduring memorials behind. One half of the critical press, that portion naturally opposed to the purpose and tendency of Dr. Mansel's work, delivered itself early, and with sufficiently decisive condemnation; but the general religious public has only lately begun to understand the principles of the treatise which their chief organs, in some instances with partial reserve, but more frequently with unfaltering approval and eulogy, have commended to their admiration.* For the most part the Lecturer was welcomed with enthusiasm as the accomplished and decisive critic of Rationalism, who had shown himself able to foil German philosophers at their own weapons, to disarm them at their own play. The minor orthodox journals in particular were loud and unstinting in their praise; the indiscriminateness of their commendation being due, partly, we may believe, to their incompetence to pronounce any judgment on the difficult questions discussed, and partly no doubt to the hasty and ill-considered treatment which the exigencies of journalism sometimes impose.

But the newspapers, magazines, and reviews were not to have the controversy all to themselves. Dr. M'Cosh, who, in the pages of our northern contemporary, while commending the Lectures in general, had modestly, but decidedly, dissented on certain points, has put some of his objections into a permanent form, and has embodied his own views on the points in question, in the sixth edition of his *Method of the Divine Government*, and in his new work, entitled *The Intuitions of the Mind*. These objections

* The *Christian Observer* seems to have been almost alone among the journals representing English orthodoxy in the protest which it uttered against some of the teachings of the lecturer. But as to some points of importance it would appear that the critic misapprehended the lecturer's meaning. See Dr. Mansel's new Preface.

reach farther than at first appears, while the positive philosophy of Dr. M'Cosh's works, very respectfully as Dr. Mansel refers to them, is, in fact, diametrically opposed to some of the main positions maintained by the Lecturer. Next, Mr. Maurice came forth in high indignation to do battle for what he holds to be the Christian philosophy and theology (both in one) of the Absolute, and for his peculiar Rationalism. Mr. Maurice's attack (*What is Revelation?*) was quickly followed by Dr. Mansel's *Examination of the Rev. F. D. Maurice's Strictures*,—a reply, the deep and vivid anger of which is just controlled into verbal propriety by the rules of polished speech. The provocation was certainly great; for Mr. Maurice had sometimes, with the fatal perverseness of understanding which is one of his characteristics, utterly distorted the Lecturer's meaning, and at other times had used, as is likewise too often his wont, hot and arrogant words of condemnation and invective: but yet Dr. Mansel's extreme disturbance of spirit is scarcely to be accounted for, except upon the supposition that he felt the force of much of his opponent's criticism. Dr. Mansel's reply was followed by a rejoinder from Mr. Maurice's pen, entitled a *Sequel to—What is Revelation?* in which, seemingly somewhat 'astounded' and half cowed at being the object of so tremendous a counter-attack, he defends himself (on the whole) with admirable temper, although with but moderate success. It is no doubt a wholesome discipline for the preacher at Lincoln's Inn, who has for many years been accustomed to judge and censure classes *ex cathedra*, often with great severity of tone, and oftener still on the strength of most offensive and insolent misrepresentation of their tenets, to be thrown so sternly back on the defensive himself, and to be compelled to meet such serious charges upon his integrity as a controversialist, as those which Dr. Mansel has brought against him. It seems to have greatly tamed the buoyancy of his style and spirit.

In the mean time, the Rev. C. P. Chretien, a member of Dr. Mansel's University, Fellow and Tutor of Oriel, himself an eminent logician, had interposed between the Lecturer and his critic in a letter to Mr. Maurice. This letter is distinguished by acuteness, gentleness, and great modesty. The writer here and there respectfully intimates his disapproval of the strong words, 'the startling intensity' of speech, in which Mr. Maurice has often allowed himself to indulge; he rebukes too, very gently, but very decisively, the arrogance with which the critic had presumed to pronounce sentence on the philosophic capacity of the Lecturer; he moreover tells Mr. Maurice, that 'a strict logician would have several opportunities of accusing

him of *ignoratio elenchi*;' and that 'even where he (himself) agreed with his conclusions, he could not adopt his method,' nor 'follow the process by which he attains them.' Nevertheless, he does, in fact, adopt most of Mr. Maurice's 'findings' as against Dr. Mansel, and assigns reasons for his 'increasing dissatisfaction' with the Lectures.

The last contribution to this interesting controversy has only just reached us as we sit down to our present task. Dr. Young, well known by his work, entitled *The Christ of History*, which has gained him not only fame, but general favour, as a Christian advocate, is the new combatant who appears in the field. His essay is entitled *The Province of Reason*; it is professedly 'a criticism of the Bampton Lecture;' and it is dedicated to Mr. Gladstone, as 'M.P. for the University of Oxford, and first Vice-Chancellor of the University of Edinburgh,' on the ground that 'this volume attempts to examine the philosophies of Oxford and Edinburgh, and to test their legitimate results.'

We ourselves come late into the field; but in this we have our advantage as well as disadvantage. We need not hesitate to say, that our prepossessions were all in favour of Dr. Mansel. His reputation as a logician and metaphysician prepared us to sit with docility and admiration at his feet. Was he not the writer of the article 'Metaphysics,' in the great Encyclopædia? the author of *Prolegomena Logica*? the most distinguished disciple of Sir W. Hamilton, and one of the editors of his posthumous works? Was he not, moreover, perfect master of all German philosophy, and yet himself on the right orthodox side? So profound a philosopher and analyst, was it not an admirable thing that he should at the same time command, on every appropriate topic, an eloquence so polished, and yet so vigorous, so just in expression, and yet so easy and copious? Did not all Oxford ring with his praises, and not only grave doctors and learned professors, but crowds of undergraduates, notwithstanding the abstruseness of the subject, flock to listen to his dissertations? Surely, here was the very champion for whom orthodoxy had been looking, her chosen knight, all cunning of fence, and armed in proof from head to foot. We think none the worse of ourselves, that our expectations were greatly raised, and that we undertook the study of the Lectures with a bias strongly in favour of the Lecturer. Nor need we scruple to admit, that we have the reverse of a predilection for any opinion or judgment, especially in opposition to a professed upholder of orthodoxy, which may be put forth by Mr. Maurice. Nevertheless, we are compelled

to say, that close study and repeated perusal of Dr. Mansel's volume have brought us to the conclusion, that it is, notwithstanding many high excellencies, in various respects an unsound and dangerous book; and that, as regards the controversy between the Lecturer and Mr. Maurice, the truth lies about midway between the two.

No one can avoid connecting the present undertaking of Dr. Mansel's to fix 'the limits of religious thought' with the previous attempts of Sir W. Hamilton to assign the boundaries of philosophic speculation. Dr. Mansel, indeed, himself does not affect, and has no desire, to conceal the fact, that his own treatise is but a sequel to the discussions of his distinguished master. He cites his apophthegms, applies his principles, develops his hints, adapts his arguments. Sir William criticized and resolved into its constituent fallacies the philosophy of the Absolute, as philosophy; and his distinguished disciple would do the like with the same philosophy as applied to, or transmuted into, theology. He would reverse the transmutation, and then by dissipating the philosophy dissolve the theology. Sir William, moreover, having disposed of transcendental idealism, professed to establish 'natural realism' in its place. So, Dr. Mansel, undertaking in the first place, by a fundamental criticism, to extirpate Rationalism, professes afterwards to lay a solid foundation for a plain and sober biblical theology.

So far the parallel holds good, at least in general. It is an interesting and not an unimportant question how far the results actually attained by the master and the disciple respectively will show a corresponding parallel. We fear it must be pronounced that, on the whole, in its positive aspect, Sir William Hamilton's philosophy has been but a partial success, while even as a negative and destructive *organon* its principles and results have not been altogether unassailable.

We need not profess our profound admiration of the wonderful philosophic capacity, the unbounded learning, the pure and noble love of truth, the fearless impartiality, and, withal, the reverent religious spirit, of the late Professor. We need not say that we, in common with nearly all in these islands or America who have any right to give an opinion on the subject, and with not a few in France and other continental countries, esteem him to be immeasurably the greatest metaphysician that Britain—or even Europe, if we except Kant—has known for a century past. But still there are problems which even the mightiest intellect cannot master, difficulties which even the keenest and subtlest analytic faculties cannot resolve. Sir William accomplished more than often falls to the lot of one man, however gifted, to accomplish;

but he was not able to accomplish all at which he aimed. He has no doubt—and this is perhaps his most valuable achievement—exploded the philosophy of the Absolute for those that apprehend his analysis and arguments; but in the course of the very argument in which he did this, he was led by his over-subtlety of logical refinement to invent a peculiar distinction between the Infinite and the Absolute, which, so far as we know, no one has since adopted, and which metaphysicians of great eminence have not been ashamed to confess themselves unable even to apprehend. He carried the negative bias of his philosophy, in antagonism to the transcendental extreme, so far as to reduce our conception of infinity to a *mere* negation, and to represent our conviction in regard to it as a mere impotency of the mind. So also he resolves our necessary and intuitive causal judgment into a mere consequence of the general law of relativity; he derives it, to quote Dr. M'Cosh's words, 'not from a "positive power" but a "negative impotence," not from a "particular force" but a "general imbecility."' He is thus led to yield up the theistic argument derived from the works of nature and the intelligence of man, and concludes that 'the *only* valid argument for the existence of God rests on the grounds of man's moral nature.' He truly describes the German transcendental systems as resting on the doctrine of a 'philosophic omniscience.' No less truly does he describe his own doctrine as that of a 'philosophic nescience.' There can be no doubt which of these extremes is the wiser, humbler, safer; but to us it does appear that Sir William has gone somewhat to an extreme as regards the negative character of his philosophy.

Nor will even his doctrine of perception be found to be so clear, direct, and all-satisfying as has been supposed. We do not mean to deny its worth. It appears to us to be much the best hitherto propounded, most consistent with the entire world of consciousness, and going farther than any other towards solving the difficulties and harmonizing the facts involved in the reciprocal relations of matter and mind. We cheerfully admit that in the course of his exposition of the phenomena of consciousness, Sir William Hamilton has thrown important light upon many questions of psychology,—that he has introduced a truly philosophic order and harmony into its divisions and nomenclature,—that he has unanswerably vindicated the veracity of our native intuitions and instinctive beliefs,—that he has exploded many errors, and swept away, especially by his criticism of Dr. Brown, much subtle and mischievous fallacy: but yet we doubt whether in this department he has effected all that his admirers suppose; we doubt whether his philosophy merits the descrip-

tion so frequently given of it, that it is pre-eminently the 'philosophy of common sense.' Though ultimately founded on the principle of the veracity of our direct and simple sense-perceptions, his 'natural realism,' as developed, is a theory of perception very remote indeed from anything which would be spontaneously suggested to the 'vulgar' mind, to which as a standard Dr. Reid delighted to make his appeal. Though he calls certain of our faculties 'presentative,' and lays presentation at the basis of perception, yet in fact his might as fitly be called a representative as a presentative theory of perception; not representative, indeed, in the same sense as Dr. Brown's, but still representative. Dr. Reid held the 'vulgar' belief that ten men see one and the same sun. Sir William Hamilton gives the direct negative to this teaching of the philosopher whom he professed to follow, and affirms that they see 'ten different suns.' His doctrine is, that what we perceive in vision is not the object we are said to see, but the extremities of the rays of light from that object which meet our retina; that 'to say that we perceive by sight the sun or moon is a false, or an elliptical, expression,' and that 'it is not by perception, but by a process of reasoning, that we connect the objects of sense with existences beyond the sphere of immediate knowledge.'* His uniform doctrine as to all human knowledge is, that it is *merely* phenomenal and relative. 'Whatever we know, or endeavour to know, God or the world, mind or matter, the distant or the near,—however great, and infinite, and various may be the universe and its contents, these are known to us, *not as they exist*, but as our mind is capable of knowing them.'† And although he does not follow Kant in making space and time mere 'spectral forms' of thought, yet he carries 'his philosophy of nescience' so far as to consider them '*but forms* of thought,' to which (as apprehended by us) we do not know that there exists any *correspondent* objective reality.

Such a philosophy as this, we submit, it is a misnomer to designate broadly and characteristically as the philosophy of 'presentative perception,' still more as the 'philosophy of common sense.' We do not deny its principles,—far from it. We not only admire, but in the main accept it. Nevertheless we do not think, that, on the whole, and in a positive sense, Sir William has, in his philosophy, achieved more than a partial

* Lectures, vol. ii., p. 163.

† It has been well remarked, that 'this majestic deliverance is either a mere truism or a plausible sophism, innocuous in one acceptation and dangerous in another.' See also some excellent observations by Dr. McCosh in his *Method of the Divine Government*, Sixth Edition, pp. 537, 538.

success. He has left the world wiser and with a clearer philosophical atmosphere than he found it. He has been able to dissipate some noisome fogs and mists which darkened the region of speculation; but yet amid the obscurity which still hangs over the view there mingles with former accumulations some Hamiltonian haze. Invaluable as a criticism,—marking an epoch of enlarged and exact science, so far as regards logical method,—the most important results of his philosophy have nevertheless been merely negative.

Dr. Mansel's treatise, we must now say, can scarcely be considered to have attained even a partial success. We should not dare to say of Sir William Hamilton's philosophy that it has been a failure; that would be less than justice. But we fear that posterity will regard as a failure Dr. Mansel's attempt to fix 'the limits of religious thought.'

The Scottish Professor demolished the transcendentalism of Fichte and Schelling; the Oxford logician rather affords materials for refuting, than has refuted, the Rationalism of the same philosophers and of their successors, Hegel, Marheineke, and Strauss. His *reductio ad absurdum* of their presumptuous theology is so over-subtle as greatly to impair the force of his arguments; and his negativism, his 'philosophy of nescience,' as applied to rational theology, leads to results so extreme as to involve in discredit the positions which he would maintain. And in seeking to restrict the functions of Reason within safe limits, he is in danger of so depressing and degrading her as to deprive her testimony of all independence, and her judgment of all authority. The witness of a slave counts for little in a court of law. Reason, too, bound and imprisoned, can lift no voice of power. He diminishes the basis of positive argument in favour of the doctrines of Revelation, until we begin to fear that there will be no room left for any massive and effectual defences to be raised.

No one, indeed, can read this volume without finding proof on every page that it is the work of a profound thinker and accomplished man, than whom none could be better fitted to bring light to the obscurest subjects, and to map out the entire region of human thought; and yet, though everywhere full of the evidences of abounding knowledge, rare analytic power, marvellous logical skill and subtlety, though distinguished by a style equal to all demands, and flexible to every change of subject, so that a paragraph of swift and vigorous logical word-play, which might have excited the admiration of Aquinas, is often followed by a passage of bright and finished eloquence worthy of the fervid and polished genius of Bossuet; yet, on the whole, these Lectures are found to be a disappointing and disheartening

volume. Dr. Mansel has had much to do with Germans, German metaphysics, German logic; and their metaphysics and logic seem really to have been too much for his metaphysics and logic: he has been bewildered and confounded. Not willing, however, to surrender to their conclusions, he has adopted their definitions and premises, and, working them out in a variety of directions, has shown that they lead to nothing but endless contradictions. Thus he has obtained a *reductio ad absurdum* of their transcendental reasonings. This reduction is the merit of the book; but the fault is,—the main fault, and the source of other faults,—that he has not attempted to detect and expose the fallacies involved in their definitions and premises and whole style of reasoning. He does not show us where and how they go wrong. He pronounces the whole argument to be out of bounds; but, in so doing, unless he discriminates, he simply affirms that no conclusion whatever can be arrived at by human reason on the subject of the Divine nature, even when we already have, from tradition or revelation, a general idea of Deity. He, in fact, condemns all the reasonings of Howe and Charnock on the Divine Perfections, and much of the argument of Dr. Mc'Cosh in his *Method of the Divine Government*, as incompetent and presumptuous. He cuts away the foundations of the science of natural theology. If the definitions on which the transcendental arguments as to the Deity are founded are false, that should be shown. If the arguments founded on them are fallacious, the fallacies should be detected. The point of departure from truth should be indicated; the *rationale* of the error should be made plain. But, instead of this, Dr. Mansel seems to endorse the definitions; they are the only ones, he says, which reason can accept; moreover, he professes to reason justly and logically from the premises; and yet he tells us that we must not accept any of the conclusions. In fact, as the conclusions are manifoldly contradictory, of course it is impossible to accept them. But then the one obvious and necessary inference from the false and contradictory nature of these conclusions,—that either the definitions or the reasonings, or both, are false,—this inference he refuses to recognise. 'No,' he repeats, 'the definitions are true, so far as we can see; we must have these or none. Our only remedy is not to think or reason at all about the Divine nature. If we once begin to do this, we shall find ourselves involved in endless and inextricable confusion.' It is a pity that it should be so; but unquestionably, so far as Dr. Mansel's logic may avail for us, the least absurd hypothesis by far that the philosopher can adopt, the one encumbered by much the fewest difficulties and contradictions, is that of Pantheism; though this, too, of course,

has its own fundamental contradiction and absurdity. No wonder, under these circumstances, that Dr. Mansel warns us not to reason at all on the subject of theology. But the deficiency of analysis, shown in the fundamental omission and error which we have noted, is not a little remarkable in a writer who shows so much power of analytic logic as Dr. Mansel does on almost every page of this very volume.

But, in fact, the two things now noted,—an entire mistrust of reason in things Divine, (a mistrust, let us say, with which we have great sympathy, though, in Dr. Mansel's case, we think it is carried to an extreme,) and a want of exact statement and analysis,—are, notwithstanding his accuracy of style and multiplication of logical distinctions, characteristic of these Lectures throughout. In the opening Lecture, we learn that the object of the Lecturer is to fix limits to the exercise of reason in matters of revelation; but no attempt is made to distinguish between the due and the undue exercise of reason, whether in the way of criticism, or of exposition and defence, of revelation. We are left to infer that, to exercise reason in the former way, is necessarily Rationalism, and to be condemned as such; and to exercise it in the latter way, Dogmatism,—no less an evil in the opposite direction. Subsequent explanations in the new Preface have somewhat qualified this general impression, or were designed to do so. But so far as the Lecture itself is concerned, our statement is strictly correct.

Dr. Mansel then proceeds to portray the Rationalism which he opposes, and which is, for the most part, the transcendental Rationalism of Germany. But here, again, what the multitude of his readers will desiderate is undoubtedly such an introduction, however slight, to the transcendental philosophy from which that Rationalism is a necessary and immediate derivative, as may enable them clearly to perceive the sweep of its principles and the scope of the Lecturer's argument. Moreover, there is required a succinct but sufficient discrimination of this Rationalism from the more 'vulgar Rationalism' which is commonly to be met with in this country. It would have been well, too, for ordinary readers to have been informed what is the type into which the German Rationalism has passed, the form which it has assumed in England. To fight hard and long against the real German Rationalism is in this country but beating the air. It may be that at Oxford others besides Professor Jowett are semi-Hegelians; judging from these Lectures, we might be disposed to imagine that German transcendentalism outright had taken hold of half the inquiring and energetic minds of the University; but we cannot really think that such is the case

even in Oxford. Out of Oxford, the substitutionary forms of philosophy which correspond to the doctrines of Schelling and Hegel, are so transmuted from their German originals, so far adapted to the atmosphere of English thought, that Dr. Mansel's refutation will not be felt by the heretics to have any crushing or conclusive force. Mr. F. W. Newman's transcendentalism differs very materially from every German type; Maurice's Theology of the Absolute, though doubtless derived ultimately (through Coleridge) in part from that of Schelling, is yet very different in its actual doctrinal embodiment and the practical results of its application to Scripture. Owing to the want of preliminary information, of exact analysis, and of obvious relation to existing heresies, most of the abstruser parts of the second and two following Lectures must seem to ordinary readers to be wanting in practical bearing upon the questions of the day. In England we are not accustomed to the subtleties of Hegel's logic. We know nothing of any attempts to draw out *à priori*, and from the depths of our intuitions, a complete science of the Infinite and the Absolute. English readers feel themselves befogged and bewildered amidst these regions of speculation. It may be that now and then some of the Lecturer's illustrations may afford them some light as to the manner in which he wishes his arguments to be applied to heretical and rationalistic objections against the doctrines of revelation. But such applications of the Lecturer's transcendental logic seem to the average student, even though tolerably well educated in college lore, not much unlike applying the higher Calculus to the solution of a question in the Rule of Three.

One of the chief characteristics of Dr. Mansel's argumentation is the use which he makes of the distinction—a distinction, it seems, in the form in which he makes it, altogether his own—between speculative and regulative truth. This distinction plays a great part in the volume. Yet with so little clearness and precision is it laid down that Mr. Chretien, not being able to find any specific statement as to what may be considered speculative truths, comes to the conclusion, after an elaborate comparison and induction of a number of passages bearing upon the point, that the Lecturer does not believe that we have any knowledge whatever of speculative truth. This conclusion of Mr. Chretien's seems to be fairly reached; and is accepted as ascertained and settled not only by Mr. Maurice, but by the able critic in *Fraser*. The Lecturer, however, himself disallows it in his latest addition to the new Preface, and endeavours to explain what are to be understood by speculative truths. His explanation is not satisfactory to us; and does not, we think, well agree with several

passages in the Lectures. But to this point we shall have occasion again to refer.

Closely connected with his views on the subject of regulative truth is the position which the Lecturer occupies on the subject of morality. He maintains that the highest principles and maxims of morality that man can attain, even with the help of revelation, are merely relative and regulative. His doctrine is, that unless man could attain to an intuition of the Infinite and the Absolute, it were vain for him to suppose that his conscience could own a law of absolute morality. The morality of heaven and that of earth are not to be assumed to coincide; much less can the law of morality which makes its appeal to the human conscience be identified with the prototypal Divine morality. In this decision Dr. Mansel not only contradicts Howe and Cudworth, M'Cosh as well as Maurice; he likewise contravenes the judgment of Kant, and abandons the guidance of Hamilton. We need not add, that his doctrine on this point is directly opposed to what not mystics alone, but Methodists, have hitherto believed to be the teaching of the Scriptures and the experience of believers.

Such being the Lecturer's views as to truth and morals, it was to be expected that he would reduce to very narrow limits the possible sphere of spiritual intercourse with God. The feeling of dependence and the sense of moral obligation are made to sum up our whole religious consciousness. As Mr. Maurice justly says, 'to know' is construed to mean the same thing as 'to form notions about;' and the possibility of our having any direct spiritual knowledge of God is denied on grounds which would equally serve to prove that the wife can have no knowledge of her husband, the mother of her child, or even the man of his own personality. On this point, again, we are happy to note that the Lecturer has, in his *Examination*, &c., made some subsequent and qualifying explanations; but we speak of the teaching of the Lectures.

Finally, though Dr. Mansel sometimes speaks as if the strait limits of our present shadowy and confused knowledge of God might be enlarged in a future state; yet, in fact, his reasoning distinctly implies, and sometimes his language plainly intimates, that human beings can never attain, in this world or the next, to any other but a merely 'regulative' knowledge of God, nor be extricated from the hedge of confusions and contradictions which must, according to Dr. Mansel's philosophy, for ever environ a finite mind in its attempts to conceive of the perfections of the Godhead.

We have now endeavoured to state what appear to us to be

the chief defects of Dr. Mansel's work, so far as regards the general scope and strain of its teaching. One more remark we must make in criticism of what we cannot but regard as a very serious, though rather incidental than essential, fault in the volume. We refer to his method of arguing with objectors against particular doctrines of revelation. He too often endeavours to silence such objectors by means of arguments which, to our thinking, may be demonstrated to be mere logical juggles, —scholastic and verbal fallacies. This is a grave charge, but only, we think, too easy to be proved.

Let it not be supposed,—once for all we would offer this *caveat*,—that we are blind to the many beauties and excellencies which adorn and enrich the volume. It is not only a mine of knowledge, equally rare and valuable, to which students, for years to come, will turn for information and direction, but it abounds with passages of deep and precious truth, expressed in language at once chaste and vivid, and rising often, without apparent effort, into strains of rich but unaffected eloquence. Here is wealth of knowledge, thought, impressive speech, from which half a dozen Bampton Lectures of the ordinary calibre might be replenished. Still, in attempting to furnish a comprehensive critical estimate of a volume, we must judge of it by its general scope and characteristic ideas, not by the incidental illustrations or expositions which it may afford of commonly accepted truths. It challenges attention by that in its teaching which is new, peculiar, and emphatic. And if the writer is one of great authority and imposing reputation, and at the same time that which he puts forth as his own special teaching and most intimate conviction is of dangerous tendency, the duty of dwelling mainly—or even, if the limits of space at the reviewer's disposal are strict and narrow, only—upon the peculiar errors and defects of his work, however displeasing it may be, is yet incumbent and imperative.

We have said that, in his first Lecture, Dr. Mansel opens the subject of Rationalism and Dogmatism. Both these he regards as essentially the same error, working only in opposite directions. The dogmatist is one who affords Revelation the patronage and advocacy of his Reason. The rationalist is one who applies his Reason to the unfriendly, or at least independent, criticism of Revelation. The common error of both consists in assuming that Reason is competent to sit in judgment upon the ideas of Revelation, and to discern the bearings and relations of Divine and spiritual truths. But what then? Is there to be no doctrinal theology? Or is all application of Reason in judgment of the meaning, or in doubt of the apparent meaning, of Scripture,

profane and unlawful? Is it Rationalism in a Romanist when a Protestant doubt begins to struggle up in his mind, and finally prevails, against that doctrine of Transubstantiation which he has been taught to regard as the plain teaching of Scripture? 'Dogmatism and Rationalism,' says the lecturer, 'are both products of thought, operating in different ways on the same material. Faith, properly so called, is not constructive, but receptive.' But, let us ask, can this distinction be rigidly maintained? Can faith be even receptive, if it is blankly receptive, looking neither to the right nor the left? Can it be said to receive, unless it receive intelligently? Can it receive intelligently without inferring something from that which it receives, without apprehending the relations in which the truth received stands to some other and prior truths of conviction or of consciousness?

Dr. Mansel perceives what cannot, we think, be denied, that if any scope is allowed to Reason for the exposition and defence of the doctrines made known to us by Revelation, and especially for their conciliation with each other and with the dictates of our natural understanding, it is impossible altogether to preclude Reason from the criticism of the contents of Revelation. The best expounder of revealed doctrines is the man who most clearly and completely apprehends them in their relations to each other and to mankind; but such an apprehension is also the direct preliminary to a criticism of those doctrines. The best defender of Divine Revelation, the only man who can effectually defend it, is the man who has fully appreciated the force of all the doubts and difficulties which may environ it. But this supposes that, intellectually, he has opened his Reason to the entrance, and has applied it to the consideration, of those doubts and difficulties. In so doing, therefore, he has already employed his Reason in a searching and fundamental criticism of the doctrines themselves. The way to a firm and deeply founded faith leads by the avenues of many doubts; doubts not, indeed, welcomed as such, but yet listened to till understood, and kept in view till, by the help of the Spirit of Truth, the answer has been learnt and given. It is idle, therefore, to warn the critical Reason altogether away from the ground of Revelation, unless dogmatic theology and (so-called) Rationalism are to be immolated together upon the altar of blind authority and tradition.

But, in fact, it cannot be supposed that Dr. Mansel intended to stigmatize as Rationalism all exercise of Reason, in however humble and reverent a temper, in the way of criticizing the contents of Revelation. To do so would be to cashier, at a stroke, the science of biblical criticism and exegesis, and to silence all appeal to the internal evidences of Scripture, which obviously

imply the exercise of such criticism. The Lecturer himself, indeed, in his last Lecture, admits the legitimacy of the appeal to internal evidence, only guarding what he says by just and needful cautions.

'The lesson to be learnt,' he tells us, 'from an examination of the Limits of Religious Thought, is not that man's judgments are *worthless* in relation to Divine things, but that they are *fallible*: and the probability of error in any particular case can never be fairly estimated without giving their full weight to all collateral considerations. We are, indeed, bound to believe that a revelation given by God can never contain anything that is really unwise or unrighteous; but we are not always capable of estimating exactly the wisdom or righteousness of particular doctrines or precepts. And we are bound to bear in mind that *exactly in proportion to the strength of the remaining evidence for the Divine origin of a religion, is the probability that we may be mistaken in supposing this or that portion of its contents to be unworthy of God.*'—Page 156.

Unfortunately, however, in his first Lecture, when dealing expressly with the subject of Rationalism, Dr. Mansel not only makes no attempt to draw a line of discrimination between the lawful and the unlawful use of Reason in regard to Revelation, but seems almost to ignore the fact that Reason may in any way or to any degree be rightfully used. The use of Reason is continually spoken of, but only as a thing to be condemned, whether employed in criticism or in exposition of Revelation. It is scarcely recognised, even by distant implication, that Reason, whilst incompetent to pronounce authoritatively upon Divine realities and 'the things of the Spirit,' stands at the same time in relation to a lower sphere of facts and consciousness, within which it not only may but must be employed, in co-ordination with the teachings of Divine Revelation, in harmony with the illumination which descends from the fountain of supernal reason and of essential truth.*

But if Dr. Mansel's animadversions on Rationalism and rationalistic methods in his first Lecture are vague, his remarks on the subject of Dogmatism are open to much more serious objection. When our thinking in regard to what we have been taught to receive as the teachings of Revelation assumes the phase of doubt, a truly Christian reverence will prompt us to doubt of our doubt more gravely than of that concerning which the doubt arose, and to hesitate long before we allow it to settle into the form of dissent or denial; and in the midst of all our intellectual uncertainties, we shall still retain a heart of reverent trust in the great whole of Revelation. But surely when our

* See Richard Watson's Works, vol. vii., pp. 46, 50, 68-70.

own Reason and Conscience approve and accord with the doctrines of Revelation; when we seem clearly to see their truth and glory, and to discern their agreement alike with each other, with our own consciousness, and with the general strain of Providential order and government, we need not then hesitate and fear to indulge the promptings of our Reason, to shape into expression the consent which our faculties yield to Revelation, to set forth articulately the intellectual and moral harmony and satisfaction of which we have become happily conscious. Yet even such an exercise of Reason as this, however careful the reasoner may be to keep constantly within sight of the plain and sure landmarks of Revelation, however cautiously he may check and test his inferences at every step by taking note of their bearings, is condemned by the language of Dr. Mansel.

'I do not include,' he says, 'under the name of Dogmatism, the mere enunciation of religious truths, as resting upon authority and not upon reasoning. The Dogmatist, as well as the Rationalist, is the constructor of a system; and in constructing it, however much the materials upon which he works may be given by a higher authority, yet, in connecting them together and exhibiting their systematic form, it is necessary to call in the aid of human ability.....Scripture is to the theological Dogmatist what Experience is to the philosophical. It supplies him with the facts to which his system has to adapt itself. It contains, in an unsystematic form, the positive doctrines, which further inquiry has to exhibit as supported by reasonable grounds and connected into a scientific whole. Theological Dogmatism is thus an application of reason to the support and defence of pre-existing statements of Scripture.'—Pp. 2, 3.

Such is the Dogmatism, as defined by himself, which the Lecturer condemns, and of which he says that it 'represents a system from which, when nakedly and openly announced, the well-regulated mind almost instinctively shrinks back;' and that, as 'Rationalism represents the spirit which diminishes from the word of God,' this 'represents that which adds to it.' But if Dogmatism, *i. e.*, dogmatic theology, is thus absolutely and indiscriminately to be condemned, in what is the study of the Scriptures to consist, and what is the function of theologians? There is one phrase which escapes from the Lecturer in this Lecture, which perhaps may throw a little light upon his particular views with regard to this point. 'It may be,' he says, 'that that man' (the critical Reasoner) 'has employed the test of reasonableness only in the refutation of opinions, *concerning which the Church has pronounced no positive judgment*; but has he fenced his method round with any cautions, to prevent its being used for the overthrow of Christianity itself?' (Page 8.)

The words which we have put in italics are certainly remarkable. What can they imply but that the doctrines of Christianity are to be learnt from the definition and judgment of the Church? But, leaving out of view the difficulty of defining what is to be understood by the Church, and what it is that the Church, however understood, has decided in respect to doctrine, all we wish here to remark is, that if the authority of the Church were to be an end of controversies, it would only destroy Rationalism by assuming, in its corporate capacity, to be the shrine of infallible Reason, and only put an end to Dogmatism by claiming, in the like capacity, a monopoly of the right to dogmatize.

We are, indeed, deeply sensible of the dangers which are connected with the tendency to reduce theology to a round and perfect system and science. When dealing with the Divine attributes, or the reasons of the Divine procedures, we would take very few steps indeed in the way of merely logical inference, and these only where they served manifestly to connect and harmonize certain truths of Revelation already given. Systematic theology has often overstepped its boundaries. It has ventured to speculate where it had no data; has pronounced judgment where true wisdom would but have humbly meditated and reverently adored. And precisely in proportion as it has thus transgressed, has it become arrogant, and bigoted, and bitter. But yet, to borrow the words of Richard Watson, 'it cannot be doubted, incautiously and erroneously as the principle has been applied, that human reason, when illuminated by revelation, is raised into a very interesting correspondence with eternal reason. The mind of God is imparted to man, and the mind of man to a certain extent elevated in its knowledge to the wisdom of God. Truth in the revelation of Scripture is not always stated on mere authority; there is often a condescension to us as rational creatures, and we are permitted to rise a few steps towards that state where the reason of things will be more largely unfolded to our inquiring faculties.'* When the Great Teacher was walking to Emmaus with the two disciples, His question and His text was, '*Ought not the Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory?*' When He stood among His disciples the same evening at Jerusalem, His language was to the same effect: '*Thus it is written, and thus it behoved the Christ to suffer,*' &c. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews argues in the like strain: '*For it became Him,*' [the Father,] 'in bringing many sons to glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.... Wherefore in all

* Richard Watson's Works, vol. vii., pp. 72, 73.

things *it behoved Him* ' [the Divine Son] ' to be made like unto His brethren,' &c. (Luke xxiv. 26-46; Heb. ii. 10, 17.) Surely Christian teachers must take such passages as these both for their texts and their models. To expound these texts, to enter really into their meaning, is to compose a chapter of a treatise on doctrinal theology. Systematic theology, then, cannot be done away, so long as the Bible is to be the subject of real, earnest study. Reason must continue to be applied to the exposition, ' support, and defence of pre-existing statements of Scripture.' Here, again, however, we would remember the caution of the same divine we have already quoted. Human reason ' owes all its light ' on these subjects ' to the revelation, and cannot go beyond it. With even the clue in its hand, it extricates itself no farther from the labyrinth than it is led by the hand of inspiration.'*

Our complaint against Dr. Mansel is, that he condemns Dogmatism in this Lecture indiscriminately. He seems to allow no room whatever for the exercise of Reason in support of Revelation.

We have explained our objection to the text of the Lecture itself. It is now necessary to advert to Dr. Mansel's retractions, as given in his Preface. We say retractions, for such they certainly are. It may be, that the indiscriminateness of the censures on which we have been commenting was the result of inconsideration and of rapid composition. If so, how serious a blemish is this in such a work! But, whether or not, the objections of some of his critics on the points in question have not been without effect. In the Preface to the Fourth Edition the Lecturer thus explains what he would be understood to mean.

' All Dogmatic Theology is not Dogmatism, nor all use of Reason, Rationalism, any more than all drinking is drunkenness. The dogmatic or the rational method may be rightly or wrongly employed; and the question is to determine the limits of the legitimate or illegitimate use of each. It is expressly as extremes that the two systems are contrasted: each is described as leading to error in its *exclusive* employment, yet as being, in its utmost error, only a truth abused. If reason may not be used *without restriction* in the defence any more than in the refutation of religious doctrines; if there are any mysteries of revelation which it is our duty to believe though we cannot demonstrate them from philosophical premises; this is sufficient to show that the provinces of Faith and Reason are not co-extensive. But to assert this is surely not to deny that the dogmatic method may be and has been rightly used within certain limits. The dogmatism

* Watson, vol. vii., p. 75.

which is condemned is not system, but the extravagance of system. If systematic completeness is made the end which the theologian is bound to pursue at every cost; if whatever is left obscure and partial in revealed truth is, as a matter of necessity, to be cleared and completed by definitions and inferences, certain or uncertain; if the declarations of Scripture are in all cases to be treated as conclusions to be supported by philosophical premises, or as principles to be developed into philosophical conclusions;—then indeed Dogmatic Theology is in danger of degenerating into mere Dogmatism. But it is only the indiscriminate use of the method which is condemned, and that not simply as an employment of reason in religious questions, but as an employment beyond its just limits.'—*Mansel's Bampton Lectures*, pp. ix., x.

That Dr. Mansel did not really so express himself as to be understood to argue only against 'the extreme,'—at any rate, in the case of Dogmatism,—our previous quotations have shown. Still we are glad to accept the foregoing explanation as expressing his deliberate meaning. Mr. Maurice's manner of treating this question of Rationalism and Dogmatism, and the Lecturer's arguments in relation to it, is not only extremely (we might say amusingly) characteristic, but deserves attention for the light which it throws upon certain points connected with the Maurician variety of transcendental rationalism, to which we shall presently advert. He repudiates altogether Dr. Mansel's definitions, and, having substituted his own, proceeds to launch forth into an entirely independent current of speculation; then, because the Lecturer's conclusions as to the Rationalism and Dogmatism which he has defined are, as might be expected, widely different from those of Mr. Maurice as to *his* Rationalism and Dogmatism, he pronounces strong condemnation on the Lecturer. But surely a writer is at liberty to define his own terms; surely a diatribe on altogether different subjects, though called by the same names, is no criticism of the Lecturer's arguments. Mr. Maurice, it is well known by those who have studied his writings, believes every word to have its own essential meaning, which each man may be cognizant of for himself, without the aids of dictionaries or critical induction. He believes, in fact, in the divinity of words, seeming to regard this tenet as a sort of corollary from the Divinity of the Word; or at least, as a necessary consequence from the principles of his characteristic Realism. Hence he systematically eschews verbal definitions.* Accordingly, as Dr. Mansel says, in his *Examination*, &c., (pp. 36, 37), 'he forswears history and its applications, and retires within himself to evolve the ideas of a

* See, for instance, *Essays*, pp. 3-5.

Dogmatist and Rationalist from the depths of his own consciousness.' But the most curious and surprising part of the business is that, while admitting the truth of this description of his method of proceeding, he yet supposes that his procedure was pertinent. To Dr. Mansel's objection that 'the portraits produced by Mr. Maurice's process may have more or less merit in themselves; but, at all events, they are utterly unlike any that appear in the Bampton Lectures,' he supposes that he is rendering an intelligent reply, when he says, 'Certainly; they professed to be unlike. I demurred to the process on which Mr. Mansel produced his portraits. I suggested another. They are open to comparison.' His extraordinary intellect, so subtle and piercing in certain directions, but seemingly so obtuse in others, does not perceive that the portraits by the two hands are *not* 'open to comparison,' because they do not profess to represent the same originals.

Dr. Mansel objects that in Mr. Maurice's sketch the words in question 'denote certain states of temper' in which criticism or controversy is carried on, which 'can be ascertained only by an inspection of the heart, and the knowledge of which is, therefore, confined to the individual himself, and to Him to whom all hearts are open;' which cannot, therefore, 'be a legitimate object of criticism.' Mr. Maurice thinks it pertinent to reply that he has described, from his own experience, tempers of mind which, he doubts not, are common to 'the peasant and the scholar;' and, therefore, each man may, by an appeal to his conscience, pronounce judgment how far his descriptions apply to himself. But is this a reply to Dr. Mansel's objection? Certainly, to hold controversy with Mr. Maurice must be much like fighting a shadow, or chasing a will o' the wisp. Well might Mr. Chretien say that 'a strict logician' would have occasion, in several instances, to charge Mr. Maurice 'with an *ignoratio elenchi*.'

But Mr. Maurice's illustrations of what he does mean by a 'Rationalist,' or a 'Dogmatist,' are still more rare and exquisite than his logic. Every man, he says,—

'is a Dogmatist in the offensive, immoral sense, whensoever he confounds that which *seems to him* or to any man with that which *is*; he is a Dogmatist in an honest and true sense whensoever he swears with deliberate purpose that something is, and from that no man and (or?) devil shall tear him away.'—*What is Revelation?* p. 197.

As to Rationalism, the oracle explains, as follows:—

'I have listened to the words of some wise man, a lecturer on Moral Science, it might be, or on Physical. I have been asking

myself the reason of his statements; I have not had my ears open to take in what he said, just because I was busy with that question. I have looked at a picture which other people admired, which it would have done me good to admire. I have asked for the reason why I should admire it, and that occupation of mind made it impossible for me to receive any blessing from the picture. This restless rationalism pursues us through our lives into every corner of them,' &c.—*What is Revelation?* pp. 198, 199.

This explanation of what he means by Rationalism is repeated with naïve neatness and simplicity in his *Sequel*:—

'A person looking at a picture or a natural landscape, and asking himself continually, "*Why* are we to admire this?" "*Why* is this beautiful?" would be, in my sense of the word, an offending rationalist.....I think the student of the picture who lets the "*why*" come between himself and the object, is yielding to an immoral, I will repeat my former expression, to a "detestable" habit.'—*Sequel*, pp. 145, 146.

Now we presume that what Mr. Maurice really means by this—or at least the form which his principle would assume in the apprehension of a man whose mental soundness had not been 'touched' by Maurician transcendentalism—is, that our intuitions are simple, certain, undecieving, the first foundation of judgments and mental operations; that to seek for a reason of them is vain and evil; and that the judgment which the mind pronounces on a picture or landscape is an intuitive sentence, the grounds of which, therefore, ought not to be inquired into. But surely, besides the fact that such judgments depend on very complex mental operations, and are by no means mere and simple matters of intuition,—otherwise the taste of all men as to pictures and scenery would be alike,—surely it is little less than insane for a man to pronounce it 'immoral' and 'detestable' for a metaphysician or artist to analyse his sense of beauty. When Alison and Jeffrey published their treatises on the Principles of Beauty, when Reynolds published his Lectures on Painting, when speculators from the time of Plato downwards have treated of the elements of harmony in form, or sound, or thought, or feeling, they have all been 'offending rationalists!' They have committed the sin of profane Rationalism against the intuitional Revelation.

As for Mr. Maurice's definition of Dogmatism, this to plain men seems not less eccentric than the other. It is, however, but a consequence of his own peculiar transcendentalism, that transcendental Rationalism of the Coleridgean Logos School, which is now tolerably well understood. It is but a vein of his

special doctrine of the universal Reason, the infallible Light, which shines into the spirit of every man, or would shine if fogs bred in the low grounds of his own heart did not becloud it round.

'I will repeat it even to weariness: the question is concerning that which *is* and that which is not; whether there is any faculty in man that can be brought to perceive that which is, and to reject that which is not, *in any matter whatsoever*;...whether it is this to which God Himself appeals.'—*What is Revelation?* p. 259.

These sentences express Mr. Maurice's serious meaning, and the italics are his own.

'Out of Laputa or the Empire,' as Sir William Hamilton says, one would not expect to meet with such hallucinations as these. This, however, we repeat, is Mr. Maurice's Rationalism.* His transcendental Reason can distinguish between 'that which is and which is not, *in any matter whatsoever!*' When his understanding questions his Reason as to the ground of its intuitions, then he is an 'offending Rationalist;' when, instead of appealing to his pure and supernal Reason, he proceeds merely upon the grounds of education or prejudice, then he is a Dogmatist.

It will be inferred, and justly, that this is not one of the points on which we have much sympathy with Mr. Maurice, in his strictures upon Dr. Mansel. Even on this subject, however, some of his observations are just and impressive. The Lecturer has condemned, as we have explained, both Rationalism and Dogmatism with little discrimination; under the name of Dogmatism in particular, he disallows almost entirely the exercise of Reason in defence or explanation of the doctrines of Revelation. His objections are illustrated by a number of doctrinal arguments as to the Atonement, some of which, on the orthodox side, have been current among divines from the days of Anselm downwards. No attempt, however, is made to show how they invade the line of demarcation between the lawful and the unlawful use of Reason. The impression, which will probably be made upon nearly all readers by the manner in which they are brought forward, is, that any use of reason in a similar manner, and for a similar purpose, is objectionable; especially as no instance whatever is given of

* 'And this because I become in the truest and fullest sense a Rationalist, because a spirit that was asleep in me before is awakened, to perceive a length and breadth and height and depth of Divinity which could, so far as I know, only reveal itself in that way,' (through the Atonement,) 'and which must open the eye that was created to discern it.'—*What is Revelation?* p. 208.

what might be, or of what actually has been, a lawful employment of reason even in the way of doctrinal exposition and defence. This being the case, we cannot but agree, in general, with the words of Mr. Maurice which we are about to quote. There are, indeed, words in connexion with these, such as in our judgment it was unjust, unbecoming, and arrogant for him to use, and such as have not unnaturally excited the Lecturer's indignation. These words we omit.

'One remark respecting this passage will strike you immediately. It is the foundation of ten notes, condemning a large portion of those writers whose names I have given you already. And yet the Lecturer does not waste even a single line in telling us what "that revealed doctrine of Christ's atonement for the sins of men" is, which they have assailed and defended. He must be perfectly aware that more than one able series of Bampton Lectures has been delivered for the express purpose of ascertaining what it is and what it is not. He must be aware that in those able treatises some notions which have attached themselves in the minds of many men to the revealed doctrine of the Atonement, are dismissed as untenable. Whether it ought to be received with these additions or without them, in what terms it should be stated or presented to men generally, we are not told. Nevertheless a number of actual men, living or dead, are held up as examples of mischievous Dogmatism or mischievous Rationalism for their way of attacking or maintaining it.....But, my dear Sir, however convenient this course may be to a University Doctor, it is not convenient, it is not right, for those who believe that they are actually entrusted with a Gospel, and who must give account to God for the way in which they discharge the trust. We must be able to say what we mean when we declare that "*God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and that He has committed to us the word of reconciliation.*" It cannot be our chief business to find out what mistakes men have made in arguing about our message on one side or the other. What is the message itself? that must be our question. From whom does it come? To whom is it addressed?'—*What is Revelation?* pp. 202-204.

The second of the Bampton Lectures takes us into the thick of Dr. Mansel's dialectics. Here the subject of the Infinite and the Absolute comes fully into view. The Lecturer lays it down, to begin with, that 'Rational Theology, considered as a scientific exposition of the nature of God, would furnish an immediate and direct criterion' by which to test a professedly Divine Revelation, but would at the same time 'enable those possessed of it to dispense with Revelation' altogether. His object is to show that no such science of Rational Theology is possible; and that our wisdom is to ascertain the limits of our own powers of

thought, and to urge no objections against the doctrines of a professed revelation, in regard to those subjects which transcend the limits of our powers of thought, and which therefore we are unable to bring within the compass of logical argument and scientific knowledge.

But here, again, it strikes us, *in limine*, that the argument, as in the former Lecture, is defective in recognising no medium between the perfect competency of Reason and its utter impotence. Reason may not be competent to draw out a 'scientific' and perfect 'exposition of the nature of God,' and yet it need not be altogether without light or power even in the high region of Rational Theology. It may not have 'presentative' intuitions as to all the elements of Divine truth, such as would be necessary in order to serve as the foundation for positive 'concepts' and scientific thought on the nature of God; and yet it may have some intuitions even in respect to things Divine which may serve as a basis for probable conclusions and for partial exposition as to the Divine character and perfections. If this is not the case, the sublime speculations of Augustine, the profound disquisitions of Anselm and Aquinas, the arguments of Barrow, of Howe, of Cudworth, and of not a few modern theologians of no mean name, must not only be regarded as defective, which we know they are, and as more or less mingled with positive misconception and error, but as absolutely worthless, so far as they are derived in any degree from the light of human reason, or depend upon the inferences of the human understanding. For our part, we would not pronounce such a verdict even upon the theological speculations of Socrates,—as these have been transmitted to us by his pupils,—much less are we prepared to do so in regard to the high studies of our Christian fathers. Perfect human science as to the heights and depths of the Divine Nature there cannot be; all attempts to construct such a science, conducted merely upon the *à priori* principle, must be futile, and fall within the scope of Dr. Mansel's main argument; all pretences to define and dictate such a science from the heights of what the Germans describe as a 'God-consciousness' are impious; but yet something may be done in the way of reasoning out from such data as we actually possess an exposition and harmony of the prime perfections of the Godhead, so far as these are cognizable by man. In order to compel the dumb submission of Reason to the teachings of Divine Revelation as regards the Most High, we are not prepared to deny it the power and right to give an intelligent assent to those teachings, and to confirm by its own humble reasonings what Reason untaught could never have discovered. This much at least we think we

may learn from the sacred text itself. 'That which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead.' (Rom. i. 19, 20.)

As directed against the speculations of the leading German metaphysicians, Dr. Mansel's arguments to prove the impossibility of a Rational Theology are relevant, and many of them possess conclusive force. But if this were intended to be the exclusive bearing of the argument, surely some statement to this effect, some qualification of the apparently unexceptive nature of his argument, should have been given. No such statement or qualification is given; the existence of an established and traditional Rational Theology, based upon altogether different postulates from those of the German Rationalism, is a fact ignored. Either Dr. Mansel must have intended to include the orthodox succession of theologians within the scope of his criticism, or he must be held chargeable with directing a volume of argument against a school of foreign theology, of which very few indeed of his hearers or readers have any knowledge, which has scarcely any adherents in this country, and which he has not discriminated from a school of theology, ancient, orthodox, and pre-eminently English, which the generality of the terms he has employed would lead most persons inevitably to regard as coming within the scope of his argument.

The common principle of all the transcendental schools whose Rationalism the Bampton Lecturer makes the subject of his criticism is,—to quote Dr. Mansel's words in the original Preface, —'There exists in the human mind a direct faculty of religious knowledge by which, in its speculative exercise, we are enabled to decide, independently of all external Revelation, what is the true nature of God, and the manner in which He must manifest Himself to the world; and by which, in its critical exercise, we are entitled authoritatively to decide for or against the claims of any professed Revelation, as containing a true or a false representation of the Divine Nature or Attributes.'* This faculty is distinguished by the transcendentalists as the Reason, in contradistinction from the inferior Understanding; and the act or state through which Reason becomes conscious of the Infinite, the Absolute, the Divine, has been called by some of those philosophers (Fichte, Schelling) 'intellectual intuition,' by others (Hegel and his school) the 'logical process.' Through this in-

* See the *Lectures*, pp. 196, 246, 193.

tuition or ecstasy man has the power to pass from the finite into the infinite, to 'become God,' as some of these philosophers are bold enough to speak,—at the least to gaze upon the Divine face to face. He is now at the centre of the sphere of all-embracing Truth, surrounded by the lights of the Eternal Reason. He can lay down the science of the Infinite, and teach the knowledge of the Absolute. He can define the nature, trace out the relations, and anticipate the revelations, of that which these philosophers call Deity. From so high a source men, *i. e.*, the *illuminati*, and all men in proportion to their capacity and culture, can bring down laws and tests by which they can weigh and measure all things, and pronounce upon their truth and divinity. Reason can thus, from its central height and throne, give judgment on all which professes to be Revelation, itself the while needing no revelation.

Such are the doctrines, with certain dialectic varieties, of Schelling and Hegel, and the schools founded on their philosophies. This is the prototypic transcendental Rationalism. The schisms of the different schools on other and more specific questions do not affect their general agreement to the extent now described.

But transcendentalism degenerates greatly when reproduced in the Anglo-Saxon soil. F. W. Newman speaks mildly of the Soul as 'the organ of specific information to us' respecting things spiritual. Theodore Parker says, 'that there is a connexion between God and the soul, as between light and the eye, sound and the ear, food and the palate, &c.' Morell, who may be called a semi-transcendentalist, encourages us to 'admit the reality of an intellectual intuition' by the consideration that then 'the absolute stands before us in all its living reality.' Emerson, who is far gone, teaches, as we all know, outright Pantheism, and deifies the impersonal Reason. Maurice, too, though we would not call him a Pantheist, yet teaches the doctrine of an impersonal Revelation, the source of infallible Inspiration and absolute Truth, as the common basis of our individual personality, and as in some way identified with the personal Reason, the eternal Word, incarnate in the Son of Man.*

This is the Rationalism which Dr. Mansel assails. But unfortunately his method of assailing it is to concede its premises and endorse its arguments, only repudiating its conclusions. This is true, at least, so far as regards the extreme

* Some passages have been already quoted as implying this doctrine. But see also *What is Revelation?* pp. 125, 391, and *Sequel*, &c., p. 245.

German form of it. As regards the English varieties, their spokesmen would for the most part repudiate alike the definitions and arguments, the premises and conclusions, which he weaves into the tissue of his Lecture.

Here it will be necessary for us to present some extracts in illustration of what we have now said, and likewise of observations which we made several pages back, in our preliminary view of the scope and method of the Lectures.

‘There are three terms, familiar as household words in the vocabulary of Philosophy, which must be taken into account in every system of Metaphysical Theology. To conceive the Deity as He is, we must conceive Him as First Cause, as Absolute, and as Infinite. By the *First Cause* is meant that which produces all things, and is itself produced of none. By the *Absolute* is meant that which exists in and by itself, having no necessary relation to any other Being. By the *Infinite* is meant that which is free from all possible limitation; that than which a greater is inconceivable; and which consequently can receive no additional attribute or mode of existence which it had not from all eternity.

‘The Infinite, as contemplated by this philosophy, cannot be regarded as consisting of a limited number of attributes, each unlimited in its kind. It cannot be conceived, for example, after the analogy of a line, infinite in length, but not in breadth; or of a surface, infinite in two dimensions of space, but bounded in the third; or of an intelligent being, possessing some one or more modes of consciousness in an infinite degree, but devoid of others. Even if it be granted, which is not the case, that such a partial infinite may without contradiction be conceived, still it will have a relative infinity only, and be altogether incompatible with the idea of the Absolute....The metaphysical representation of the Deity, as absolute and infinite, must necessarily, as the profoundest metaphysicians have acknowledged, amount to nothing less than the sum of all reality. “What kind of an Absolute Being is that,” says Hegel, “which does not contain in itself all that is actual, even evil included?” We may repudiate the conclusion with indignation; but the reasoning is unassailable. If the Absolute and Infinite is an object of human conception at all, this, and none other, is the conception required. That which is conceived as absolute and infinite must be conceived as containing within itself the sum, not only of all actual, but of all possible, modes of being....Indeed it is obvious that the entire distinction between the possible and the actual can have no existence as regards the absolutely infinite; for an unrealized possibility is necessarily a relation and a limit. The scholastic saying, *Deus est actus purus*, is but the expression, in technical language, of the almost unanimous voice of philosophy, both in earlier and later times.

‘But these three conceptions, the Cause, the Absolute, the Infinite, all equally indispensable, do they not imply contradiction to each other, when viewed in conjunction, as attributes of one and the same

Being? A Cause cannot, as such, be absolute: the Absolute cannot, as such, be a cause. The cause, as such, exists only in relation to its effect: the cause is a cause of the effect; the effect is an effect of the cause. On the other hand, the conception of the Absolute implies a possible existence out of all relation. We attempt to escape from this apparent contradiction, by introducing the idea of succession in time. The Absolute exists first by itself, and afterwards becomes a Cause. But here we are checked by the third conception, that of the Infinite. How can the Infinite become that which it was not from the first?...Creation at any particular moment of time being thus inconceivable, the philosopher is reduced to the alternative of Pantheism, which pronounces the effect to be mere appearance, and merges all real existence in the cause. The validity of this alternative will be examined presently.'—*Manuel's Bampton Lectures*, pp. 30-32.

'The corollary from this reasoning is obvious. Not only is the Absolute, as conceived, incapable of a necessary relation to anything else; but it is also incapable of containing, by the constitution of its own nature, an essential relation within itself; as a whole, for instance, composed of parts, or as a substance consisting of attributes, or as a conscious subject in antithesis to an object. For if there is in the absolute any principle of unity, distinct from the mere accumulation of parts or attributes, this principle alone is the true absolute. If, on the other hand, there is no such principle, then there is no absolute at all, but only a plurality of relatives. The almost unanimous voice of philosophy, in pronouncing that the absolute is both one and simple, must be accepted as the voice of reason also, so far as reason has any voice in the matter. But this absolute unity, as indifferent and containing no attributes, can neither be distinguished from the multiplicity of finite beings by any characteristic feature, nor be identified with them in their multiplicity. Thus we are landed in an inextricable dilemma. The Absolute cannot be conceived as conscious, neither can it be conceived as unconscious: it cannot be conceived as complex, neither can it be conceived as simple: it cannot be conceived by difference, neither can it be conceived by the absence of difference: it cannot be identified with the universe, neither can it be distinguished from it. The One and the Many, regarded as the beginning of existence, are thus alike incomprehensible.

'The fundamental conceptions of Rational Theology being thus self-destructive, we may naturally expect to find the same antagonism manifested in their special applications....If an absolute and infinite consciousness is a conception which contradicts itself, we need not wonder if its several modifications mutually exclude each other. A mental attribute, to be conceived as infinite, must be in actual exercise on every possible object: otherwise it is potential only with regard to those on which it is not exercised; and an unrealized potentiality is a limitation. Hence every infinite mode of consciousness must be regarded as extending over the field of every other; and their common action involves a perpetual antagonism. How, for example, can Infinite Power be able to do all things, and yet Infinite

Goodness be unable to do evil? How can Infinite Justice exact the utmost penalty for every sin, and yet Infinite Mercy pardon the sinner? How can Infinite Wisdom know all that is to come, and yet Infinite Freedom be at liberty to do or to forbear? How is the existence of Evil compatible with that of an infinitely perfect Being; for if he wills it, he is not infinitely good; and if he wills it not, his will is thwarted, and his sphere of action limited? Here, again, the Pantheist is ready with his solution. There is in reality no such thing as evil: there is no such thing as punishment: there is no real relation between God and man at all. God is all that really exists: He does, by the necessity of His nature, all that is done: all acts are equally necessary and equally divine: all diversity is but a distorted representation of unity: all evil is but a delusive appearance of good. Unfortunately, the Pantheist does not tell us whence all this delusion derives its seeming existence.'—*Mansel's Bampton Lectures*, pp. 33, 34.

'The whole of this web of contradictions (and it might be extended, if necessary, to a far greater length) is woven from one original warp and woof;—namely, the impossibility of conceiving the co-existence of the infinite and the finite, and the cognate impossibility of conceiving a first commencement of phenomena, or the absolute giving birth to the relative. The laws of thought appear to admit of no possible escape from the meshes in which thought is entangled, save by destroying one or the other of the cords of which they are composed. Pantheism and Atheism are thus the alternatives offered to us, according as we prefer to save the infinite by the sacrifice of the finite, or to maintain the finite by denying the existence of the infinite. Pantheism thus presents itself, as to all appearance the only logical conclusion, if we believe in the possibility of a Philosophy of the Infinite. But Pantheism, if it avoids self-contradiction in the course of its reasonings, does so only by an act of suicide at the outset. It escapes from some of the minor incongruities of thought, only by the annihilation of thought and thinker alike. It is saved from the necessity of demonstrating its own falsehood, by abolishing the only conditions under which truth and falsehood can be distinguished from each other.'—*Mansel's Bampton Lectures*, pp. 35, 36.

This, then, is the result to which the Lecturer brings us, that 'Pantheism is the only logical conclusion, if we believe in the possibility of a Philosophy of the Infinite.' Logically regarded, the one pervasive difficulty of Pantheism, that it annihilates our personality, and so contradicts fundamentally our consciousness, is really but a trifle, compared to the 'web of contradictions' in which the Lecturer involves us, if we follow him in the construction of a theistic (or *quasi*-theistic) philosophy of the infinite. It is far easier to believe at once in the delusiveness of our consciousness, and to accept Pantheism, than to accept in gross the results which the Lecturer sets forth on

the theistic hypothesis. The former, indeed, *may* be accepted, as it has been by many; the latter it is impossible for any to receive. Of course this result will not at all disturb the equanimity of the Bampton Lecturer. It was his intention to show that all logical reasoning upon the subject of the Infinite and the Absolute is impossible; and he can contemplate with unmoved tranquillity the conclusion that the only logical system of 'rational theology' is the pantheistic. Those, however, who believe that some modest argument on the subject of rational theology may be safely pursued, and that the reasonings of the human mind on this high theme, though 'fallible' and imperfect, are not altogether 'worthless,' will probably be somewhat dismayed at this peremptory conclusion; some will shudder at it as something fearful. We confess we ourselves cannot altogether sympathize with Dr. Mansel's philosophic serenity as regards this point.

There is one thing in particular which gives an unpleasant aspect to this whole argument, taken along with its results. The Lecturer defines his terms unhesitatingly; he does not merely take the definitions of the philosophers against whom he is arguing. He writes as though the Absolute were a term clearly and directly expressive of an essential perfection of the Self-Existent, and as if Infinity, considered as predicable of Deity, could not possibly be understood by any human mind otherwise than as he has defined it. Then he proceeds to argue his very best from these definitions as premises. 'We may repudiate his conclusions with indignation;' but, he takes pains to assure us, 'the reasoning is unassailable.' And then, finally, he does repudiate all the conclusions to which he has forced us. Now all this is very strange and perplexing. If the definitions are correct, and the reasonings sound, the conclusions must be true. If the conclusions are contradictory and incredible, and yet the reasonings are sound, then the definitions must be false. Dr. Mansel is bound, on the basis of his own argument, either to abandon his definitions or to embrace Pantheism, or to become an utter sceptic, who not only doubts of all belief, but doubts of all doubt. But, in fact, the Lecturer refuses to do any of these things.

He tells us, indeed, that we can never form a positive concept of the nature of the Absolute and the Infinite; and that, therefore, all our reasonings on the subject must be vitiated. But to us this is by no means an evident conclusion; nor has a study of the *Prolegomena Logica* brought us to accept it. It is possible to reason, as in Mathematics, by mere symbols. Whether the words Infinite and Absolute have corresponding to them a

positive concept, or they can only be negatively defined; still, if the definition is really correct, they may find some entrance into an argument, and may afford material for the deduction of just conclusions. Is Dr. Mansel prepared to tell us that we can apprehend nothing, reason nothing, infer nothing, in theology or morals, from the doctrine of God as the Self-Existent and the Infinite? If this were his teaching, he would at least be consistent. But he lays down very different doctrine from this. 'We are compelled,' he says, 'by the constitution of our minds, to believe in the existence of an Absolute or Infinite Being,—a belief which appears forced upon us as the complement of our consciousness of the relative and finite.' (Page 45.) Now, if this be so, there must be some meaning to us in such a conception; it must be worth something; it must teach us a lesson, and convey to us a moral; it must, therefore, within duly guarded limits, furnish material for just thought and important conclusions.* If this is really so, it is simply impossible to accept as strictly true, in the unlimited generality of its terms, the sentence which follows that which we have now cited. 'But,' continues the Lecturer, 'the instant we attempt to analyse the ideas thus suggested to us, in the hope of attaining to an intelligent conception of them, we are on every side involved in inextricable confusion and contradiction.'

Sometimes, indeed, we might be led to infer that Dr. Mansel regarded the word Infinite as in fact meaningless. In one place he lays it down that 'the Infinite is a mere negation,' that 'we know what it is not,' and that 'that is all;' (p. 117;) and again, he says, that 'the Infinite, from a human point of view, is merely a name for the absence of those conditions under which thought is possible.' (Page 48.) But this is not his settled or his ruling meaning. If it were, he would not so often repeat that 'it is our duty to believe,' and that he does believe 'that God is infinite;' (pp. 59, 312, xxxiv. ;) for no man can believe, or be bound to believe, in what is merely unintelligible. Still less would he quote with approbation, in one of his notes, the following passage from *Greyson's Correspondence*, vol. ii., p. 329: 'The notion of power, indefinitely great, which the phenomena certainly suggest, is, both theologically and practically, undistinguishable from the infinite itself.' This is a pregnant, almost a startling, admission from this distinguished upholder of the Hamiltonian philosophy of nescience.

* At the time we wrote the above, we had not seen Dr. Young's very luminous and convincing remarks upon this point. We can only refer the reader to them, as fully illustrating and supporting our own view. *Vide Province of Reason*, pp. 161, 162.

Here, then, is the dilemma and contradiction in which Dr. Mansel places himself, and so, in its turn, reduces to an absurdity his own doctrine of nescience. He insists that we must believe in an Infinite and Absolute God; but he will not allow that we can form any real conception of what those words mean: he protests repeatedly that he venerates the Deity as Infinite and Absolute: he will not allow the terms to be disused; he thinks them indispensable; and yet he insists that the Infinite (as conceived by us) is either blank confusion, or chaotic contradiction, or a mere negation. What feeling, then, does the word Infinite call up in his mind? What is the *virtue* of the word, as Quintilian would say, either 'theologically or practically' considered? Does the title Infinite, as applied to Deity, signify for Dr. Mansel nothing more than 'unknown'? So, as to the word Absolute, the Lecturer considers it to be necessary to speak of the Godhead as Absolute, and to believe in God as such; but all that we can get at, as regards the meaning of the word, is, that it means *not relative*. Go farther, ask what that means, and Dr. Mansel leads you into a labyrinth of contradictions and incomprehensibilities.

As we have already shown, what his argument plainly requires of Dr. Mansel is, that he should repudiate the definitions which he has given of the terms he employs. A passage in one of the Notes to his later Preface exhibits this very luminously. 'I assert,' he says, "that the Absolute and Infinite, as defined in the German metaphysics, and in all other metaphysics with which I am acquainted, is a notion which destroys itself by its own contradictions. I believe, also, that God is, in some manner incomprehensible by me, both Absolute and Infinite; and that these attributes"—but here let us interpose the inquiry: *what attributes?* have they no definition, no description, no meaning?—"exist in Him without any repugnance or contradiction at all. Hence I maintain throughout that the Infinite of philosophy is not the true Infinite."* Dr. Mansel is, indeed, not correct in saying that he 'maintains throughout,' &c. On the contrary, he maintains that this is the only Infinite we can form any notion of, and that we must believe in some Infinite; but that, as we can form no positive conception of the Infinite, we cannot employ it as an element in reasoning. Only here and there does he imply—only indirectly and incidentally does it come out—that he repudiates the philosophic Infinite and Absolute. And the grievance of the case is, that he makes no attempt to help us to the true notion of the Infinite; and, indeed, 'main-

* Preface, p. llii.

tains throughout' that we can get no nearer to it than that incompetent philosophic definition which he adopts in his reasonings, and only indirectly repudiates through his conclusions. It is true, indeed, that in some passages of his *later Lectures*, Dr. Mansel does incidentally repudiate the philosophic Infinite. Still he merely repudiates; he does not make any attempt to revise or correct; and even in repudiating he repeats his assertion, that we can neither do without the philosophic terms nor amend the philosophic definitions: while, as regards his second Lecture, which we have been reviewing, and in which he is, to use his own words, (page 45,) 'chiefly occupied with an examination of the ideas of the Infinite and Absolute,' he may be fairly said not to repudiate, but to adhere to, the philosophic definitions.

For our own part, we can neither accept Dr. Mansel's definitions as the best which reason can frame when attempting to form an idea of the Divine character or existence, nor can we assent to all his deductions as even logically derived from his premises. But, before we remark further upon this point, let us trace out very briefly the progress of the Lecturer's argument as proceeded with in the third Lecture, that we may the better understand how he expounds and applies the philosophic doctrine of the Infinite and Absolute. In this Lecture he assigns the conditions under which alone thought is possible for man. These conditions are, that in knowledge we must be conscious of the distinction between one object and another; we must be conscious of a relation between ourselves and the objects of thought; we must know all things under the condition of succession and duration, (*i. e.*, in time,) and under the condition of personality. He goes on to argue that God, as Infinite, cannot be known in distinction from other objects, for then He would be limited; nor in relation to them, for then He would not be Absolute; nor partially known, for the Infinite cannot be said to have parts, and a partial knowledge of the Infinite is a contradictory notion; nor known in time, for the Infinite and Eternal cannot be known in time; nor out of time, for man can have no knowledge out of time; nor under the condition of personality, for 'personality is a limitation,' and the Infinite is unlimited. Perhaps the two most notable points in this Lecture are, that Consciousness and Personality are stated to be essentially limitations, and therefore incompatible with the notion of Infinity. After having brought us thus far, the Lecturer, weary enough, no doubt, of his dreary dialectics, breaks out into a strain of noble and eloquent writing, and teaches what is the true Christian faith as to a personal God, to which,

let philosophers say what they may, we must adhere, rejecting their cavils on the ground that we are incompetent to reason about the Infinite. But still he makes no attempt to point out the genesis of their errors, and persists in maintaining that in some sense we must cleave to our faith in an Infinite and Absolute God, though we cannot attempt to analyse our ideas without being bewildered in endless contradictions.

Now, what shall we say to all this? Shall we cease to speak of the Deity as the Absolute? Perhaps it would be better if we did, and spoke rather of Him as the Self-Existent. But shall we cease to speak of Him as the Infinite? Surely no, although the word is one which occurs very few times in Scripture, and only once as applied to the Divine Being. ('His understanding is Infinite.') We must still speak of God as Infinite; but we must refuse to accept for this word the abstract and mathematical sense which Dr. Mansel in his argument assigns to it. Many instances might be given from these Lectures of a most sophistical use of this word; as when, for example, Dr. Mansel speaks of a Divine attribute as 'a second Infinite,' as if the attribute were a thing *per se*. (Page 47) But one subtle pervasive fallacy is latent in the word as continually used by the Lecturer. The merely mathematical—the quasi-material—signification of the word Infinite, which of necessity is its primary meaning, such as belongs to it when we speak of *Infinite space*, (where the thought of unlimited extension cannot but come in,) is transferred to the spiritual nature of God; and thus, instead of the positive sense of absolute perfection, perfection which lacks no power, resource, or fulness, necessary to the government of the world and the accomplishment of all good things, we obtain a blank limitlessness which ends in an absolute negation, 'an infinite deal of nothing.' Is this, let us ask, a philosophical conception of Infinity? 'The word Infinite means without limits:' (it is thus in effect that Dr. Mansel reasons:) 'but law is a limit; therefore God is without law' (even self-imposed): 'order is limitation; therefore the Divine operations must not be supposed subject to method and order: personality is limitation, otherwise there would be no distinction between God as a person and the universe; consciousness is a limitation, for a conscious person must distinguish between himself and the objects of which he is conscious; each attribute or quality limits every other attribute or quality. It follows that if God is to be conceived as without limits, as Infinite, He must be conceived as possessing no distinction of attributes, as conditioned by no law or method, as unconscious and impersonal.' Does Dr. Mansel seriously propose this as philosophic reasoning, and as the only

strain of logical argument on the subject of which the human understanding is capable? So it appears. He at least considers such sophistry formidable. Not only in the body of his work, but in his Preface, when speaking in apology of his style of argument and on his own account, we find him saying, 'An Infinite person, or a combination of the several attributes of personality and moral character, *each expanded to Infinity*, appears to involve similar contradictions to those which may be elicited from the assumption of Infinite space,'* &c.

Now to us this way of speaking seems to be mere jargon, utterly unworthy of a philosopher. 'An attribute expanded to Infinity!' What a material, unphilosophical, essentially fallacious phraseology, is this! As if attributes occupied space, as if one necessarily interfered with and overlapped the other; as if the perfection of any one attribute did not imply its perfect harmony with each other perfect attribute; as if wisdom trenched on power, or the highest and widest justice on true and impartial mercy. As if by Infinite justice were meant anything but inviolable and unmixed justice, harmonizing and blending in the supreme righteousness of God with perfect love; or by Infinite mercy, anything but pure, fontal, and exhaustless love, which, expanding over the universe and assuming many forms, comes down upon the sinner in the form of wise and tender, but righteous, compassion. But we are ashamed to have to re-state, in reply to worn-out cavils which the Bampton Lectures have rehabilitated and dignified, commonplaces of theology which have been repeated by all the great fathers of orthodox Christian doctrine from Augustine downwards.

So, again, what can be more illogical than to transfer the notion of limitlessness from a quasi-material subject, and then to attempt to apply it without modification to a subject which has nothing in common with sense or matter? It is one of the first and most obvious laws of language that, in applying a word metaphorically to any subject, all those ideas denoted or connoted by it in its original application, which are incongruous and incompatible with the subject to which it is transferred, must be excluded from its meaning as metaphorically applied. When Christian theologians speak of God, their first and ruling thought is of Him as the Personal Creator and Governor of the Universe; when they speak of His attributes as Infinite, they wish to express their sense of the impossibility of fully comprehending the height and depth and fulness of any of his essential attributes, or of adding anything to their glory or perfection. It

* Preface, p. xxiv.

is in itself, therefore, contradictory and illogical to frame a logical argument to prove that, because such theologians use the word Infinite in the sense now explained, they are bound to admit a series of consequences deduced from such senses of the word as are already of necessity excluded; bound to accept as a logical consequence that their personal God, because possessed of Infinite perfections, must be conceived of as impersonal, unconscious, and possessing no distinct attributes or perfections.

The arguments which the Lecturer exhibits are, in fact, taken as a whole, a mere mass of verbal fallacies, eminently worthy of the scholastic ages, of an Occam or a Duns Scotus; but such as we should never have expected that an English theologian would have set forth as presenting serious difficulties to the understanding of Christian believers. Christian theologians know nothing of such abstractions as 'the Infinite,' 'the Absolute,'—used as names of Deity. Dr. Mansel could not allow himself to use these words without admitting, from the beginning, into his argument, without, in fact, laying down as its very basis, a principle which could not fail to vitiate it throughout. By the use of these abstract terms, he excludes from his argument the fundamental conception of God as personal; and restricts himself of necessity to a mere play upon words. His argument becomes a mere web of verbal subtleties. He assumes that the words he defines possess a constant, invariable, independent value. He himself falls continually into the logical error of attributing to that which is a mere negative, a positive meaning. He reasons as though terms which, as predicates, must of necessity take the colour and quality of their signification, to a great extent, from the subject to which they are applied, possessed one settled and immutable standard of value and meaning.

We deny, then, that Dr. Mansel's definition of the Infinite is even the true philosophical definition as understood of the Divine Being. We deny that the definition which he has given is the only one which human conception can furnish. We assert that his definition is contrary to the mind and teachings of the profoundest philosophic divines, and contrary no less to the requirements of a true philological criticism. It may be the definition on which verbal reasoners and scholastic doctors have in some cases argued; it may be (virtually) the definition which determined the form and results of Neo-Platonic speculations fourteen hundred years ago, and which is now adopted as the ground of transcendental Pantheism in Germany; but it does not accord with the universal meaning of Christian teachers and believers as to the nature and perfections of our Infinite God. The meaning of words must be determined from their use, not

settled on the arbitrary ground of simplicity. Neither is it impossible to furnish a definition of the word Infinite, which shall fairly express what is meant when it is used as a predicate of the Deity, and afford a basis for at least some partial and probable conclusions in Rational Theology. Let us adopt substantially the definition of the Infinite which has already been given by one of Dr. Mansel's critics, with whose general theology, indeed, we have little sympathy, but who appears to advantage in criticizing the Bampton Lecturer. We understand then by the Infinity of God 'unlimited energy, conditioned by definite laws, moral and spiritual, issuing from the depths of an Eternal Holiness and Eternal Reason.' We do not understand an Infinite and Absolute which 'chokes up' the universe, mental and physical, and prevents the existence of any one else.'

We have repudiated Dr. Mansel's definition of the Infinite, and have endeavoured to expose some of the ground-fallacies of his reasonings; we have also detected incidentally some of the sophistries contained in the web of his deductions. Our space will not allow us to examine his paragraphs in detail. We will only remark, that they reproduce some cavils which we thought that a succession of doctors, from the days of the great Bishop of Hippo, might be considered to have laid to rest for ever. The reader of Howe, in particular, will be astonished to find such a divine as Dr. Mansel asking, 'How can Infinite Power be able to do all things, and yet Infinite Goodness be unable to do evil?' The word *able* is here used in two senses.

The following remarks of Dr. M'Cosh, taken from his latest work, will supply some of the deficiencies in the foregoing discussion, and bear especially upon some of the extracts which we have given from Dr. Mansel's second Lecture:—

'It should be carefully observed that, according to this account, infinite is not a separate or an independently existing thing, but the attribute of a thing,—very possibly an attribute of an attribute of an existing thing. It is of something, say of space, or of the attribute of something, say the power of God, that we predicate that they are infinite. This certainly implies that no space can be added to infinite space, but does not imply that that space, because it is infinite, must contain all existence, must comprise, say, wisdom and goodness. It implies that God cannot be more righteous than He is, but does not involve that His righteousness or even that His being must embrace all being. Mr. Mansel, in the *Limits of Religious Thought Examined*, 3rd edit., p. 46, quotes the language of Hegel: "What kind of an Absolute Being is that which does not contain in itself all that is actual, even evil included?" and refers to Schelling, Schleiermacher, and Parker, as holding similar views. I am sure that the mind is not shut up into any such doctrine by its native convictions. Against

such a view the artillery of Hamilton and Mansel tells with irresistible power. They have shown most conclusively that such a notion involves inextricable confusion and hopeless contradictions....But I decidedly demur to the statement of Mr. Mansel, [that] "that which is conceived as absolute and infinite must be conceived as containing within itself the sum, not only of all actual, but of all possible modes of being." I have nothing here to say as to the absolute, but I do say we have a conception as to the infinite, the perfect,—I do not say, of the infinite, the perfect,—which does not imply this consequence, and that we can both think and speak of infinity without falling into contradictions.....I must hold it quite possible to muse and reason about the attribute "infinite," as in fact conceived and believed in by the mind, without falling into the difficulties in which the German supporters of the absolute have involved themselves; and that we can think of God and write about God as infinite, without being compelled by any logical necessity to look upon Him as embracing all existence, or to reckon it impossible or inconceivable that He should create a world and living agents different from Himself. We cannot conceive that God's power should be increased; but we can conceive it exercised in creating beings possessed of power. We cannot conceive His goodness to be enlarged; but we can, without a contradiction, conceive Him creating other beings also good. Nor are we by this conception shut up to the conclusion that the creature-power or creature-excellence might be added to the Divine power and goodness, and thus make it greater. To all quibbles proceeding in this line, I say that for aught I know, it may not be possible they should be added, or that if added they should increase the Divine perfections; and no reply could be given, drawn either from intuition or from experience, the only lights to which I can allow an appeal.'—*Intuitions of the Mind*, p. 227.

We shall not venture to say many words on the subject of the Absoluteness—if we must use the word—of Deity, by which we understand His Self-Existence. That there are oppressive difficulties to our feeble Reason, connected with the conception of the Deity as Self-Existent, we of course admit, but not that there are any necessary contradictions. We may learn from the difficulties surrounding this subject to avoid all speculations concerning the actual beginning of creation, or the 'lone depths of eternity past,' as some speak, wherein they image to us infinite space unbroken by any creaturely existence; but we need find no difficulty in receiving (this is in fact the only simple, consistent, and really easy belief) the truth of the Eternal Self-Existence of the Deity, as the all-conscious, all-causing, all-ruling, all-mighty, Source of Life and Being.

As regards the use of the word Absolute, and some of the questions connected with this word, we cannot do better than quote the following observations of Dr. Young:—

'It may be possible to imagine the non-existence of the finite universe, to conceive the Great Being, alone, in immensity; possible to conceive life, *then*, intelligence, *then*, one living intelligence. But when this is called *the* absolute, that is, absoluteness, in the abstract, who can attach a sense to the word? Absolute truth is quite intelligible. We understand by it, truth without mixture; very truth, and nothing but truth. And the Absolute God would be intelligible; meaning, very God, the real God, altogether Divine, and alone Divine. But this is not what is meant, but something perfectly different. It is the absolved God, God loosed from all relation, external and internal, *the* unconditioned, brought under no condition of relation or connexion of any kind. One might answer, even so—let it be granted, thus far, at least. The Great Being, before creation, alone, in immensity, must have been unconditioned, *ab extra*; necessarily so, for there was nothing to condition Him. But what is gained? This is only saying, that He was alone, in immensity, saying it in another form, without the slightest advantage. The statement *may* be true, at all events it cannot be denied. God was then, and must be conceived, as *the* unconditioned. But with that period and that state, save in mere abstracted contemplation, we have nothing to do; and it is impossible, speculate as we may, that we can ever KNOW, certainly know, anything respecting it.

'The era of creation, whenever, howsoever starting forth, the era of creation, *alone*, belongs to us; and, in connexion with this, I maintain that these terms—*the* unconditioned, *the* absolute, (in the sense of absolved,) not only have no meaning, but are thoroughly and utterly false. There is no being, or thing, in the universe to whom, or which, they can apply. There is, there can be, no unconditioned God to us. The God of consciousness is not unconditioned. Consciousness never revealed, never could reveal, an unconditioned God. The mere fact of the existence of a conscious creature excludes the possibility of unconditionedness in the Creator. The Great Being has voluntarily conditioned himself—that is, what we most certainly know—has voluntarily placed himself in relation with created beings and things. There is no such thing, evermore, as the unconditioned, the absolute; if, indeed, there ever was such a thing.'—*Province of Reason*, pp. 154–156:

For the rest we content ourselves with setting down the following conclusions at which we have arrived respecting the positions and reasonings contained in Dr. Mansel's argument on the subject of the Absolute. With Mr. Calderwood we understand the word as philosophically used, to import 'perfect independence both in being and in action.'* So understanding it, we hold that the Absolute may exist in relation, provided it be not a necessary relation; and may exist in necessary relation, (as the Trinity in Unity,) provided that that necessary

* *Philosophy of the Infinite*, p. 17.

relation be a part of its perfection, and provided that *ad extra*—beyond the limits of its own unity and the scope of its causative wisdom and will—there be no necessity of relation.* Let us, in regard to this point, add the very suggestive inquiries of Dr. M'Cosh.

'Is the relative necessarily conditioned? May there not be relations which are not conditions? Is everything relative necessarily finite? God stands in a relation to His works; but this does not appear to make these works stand to Him in the relation of a condition. It does not make God finite that He stands in a relation to creation.'—*M'Cosh's Method, &c.*, p. 537.

We have now done our best, according to the limits at our disposal, to supply that which we look upon as a vital defect in the Bampton Lectures. What we have feebly essayed, Dr. Mansel might have been expected powerfully to accomplish. He has, however, made no attempt in this direction. He has lent his readers no clue to extricate them from the labyrinth in which he has involved them. He does, indeed, reduce the analysis which he has given to its just estimate, when he speaks of the Infinito-Absolute of the metaphysical logic as 'the Mock-King who usurps the name of God in the realms of philosophy;' (p. 83;) but he has done nothing to expose and discredit this usurpation, except denounce its results; nay, with his logic he upholds the claims which with his heart and conscience he rejects. He rightly describes the process which he has himself exemplified when he speaks of those who 'twist and torture the Divine image on the rack of human philosophy, and call its mangled relics by the high-sounding titles of the Absolute and Infinite.' (P. 95.) But *these* 'high-sounding' words would possess more authority, and infuse more confidence, if their writer had not previously bound us hand and foot in the chains of an inexorable logic, and laid us helpless at the feet of the dismal and shapeless demon of unbelief.

The result to which Dr. Mansel conducts us in the third Lecture is, that the Absolute and Infinite are—as might be expected from the contradictions emerging in the second Lecture from the analysis of these notions themselves—merely 'names for the negation of all the conditions under which human consciousness is possible;' and consequently that no foundation can be laid in the intuitions of consciousness for a scientific knowledge of the Absolute and Infinite. Its argument is directed against those who have presumed 'to lay down canons

* After these remarks were penned, we found Dr. Young had expressed himself to the same effect.

of criticism, concerning the purpose of Revelation, and the truth or falsehood, importance or insignificance, of particular doctrines, on grounds which are tenable only on the ground of a perfect and intimate knowledge of God's counsels.' (P. 67.) In the fourth Lecture, Dr. Mansel proceeds to expound what he regards as the two principal modes of 'religious intuition,' which are a feeling of dependence, and a sense of moral obligation, and which constitute, he tells us, 'the rude materials' out of which the edifice of our religious consciousness is built up. In this Lecture there is much with which we can heartily concur. Here the Lecturer enters upon the ground of positive teaching, instead of that of negative criticism. Here, appealing to the human consciousness, he seems to spurn from him the conclusions to which his philosophical logic had conducted us, and asserts, more at large and more emphatically than in the cautionary passages which have before occurred, his faith in a personal God of infinite perfections. Nevertheless, we cannot but regard the teaching of this Lecture as meagre. We cannot ourselves consent to reduce the whole of our religious consciousness to the elements of a sense of dependence, and a conviction of moral obligation. We believe that the 'Kingdom of God' is 'righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost,' and that the religious consciousness distinctly and directly embraces these elements. We believe that 'being justified by faith we have peace with God,' and that the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the 'Holy Ghost which is given unto us.' We read, and what we read we receive as the truth, that 'because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.' (Rom. xiv. 17; v. 1, 5; Gal. iv. 6.) It is a low and defective estimate of the religious consciousness which omits all the elements of the Christian experience described in these passages. If, indeed, all that the Lecturer meant to do, was to set forth the essential elements of the universal religious consciousness of men, whether regenerate or unregenerate, his summary may be admitted as correct and complete. Some sense of dependence on a Divine Power, and some sense of moral obligation, it would seem that all men have; more than this it cannot be said that they have. But, in such lectures as those of Dr. Mansel, we should have expected to find an analysis of the higher and truly Christian consciousness,—the consciousness of the man who, being 'in Christ Jesus,' is a 'new creature.' For this consciousness man has spiritual capacities and faculties; without this he is less than man should be; these complement the merely 'natural man,' and bring him up to the standard of the ideal man. The intuitions of the

regenerate man properly belong to the Lecturer's subject; from them, indeed, mainly is derived such a spiritual knowledge of God, imperfectly received and only indirectly apprehended, as is diffused through the world of Christendom, and has been identified with the general 'Christian consciousness.' Through these faculties and their corresponding experience only can man be said to 'know God,' and to become possessed of 'life eternal.' (John xvii. 3.) This is the only intuitional knowledge and (so to speak) consciousness of God which man can enjoy. And in ignoring these, Dr. Mansel has, in fact, ignored a main part of his subject, and given occasion for Mr. Maurice's charge, that the Lecturer denies the possibility of all spiritual knowledge of God. It is as regards these points that the teaching of Mr. Coleridge and his follower Mr. Maurice seems to possess an analogy to the truth,—simulates the doctrines of spiritual religion; and therefore here in particular it was incumbent upon the Lecturer to discriminate between the true and the false spiritualism, between the Coleridgean consciousness of the Absolute and the Christian believer's knowledge of God, between the illumination and quickening of the Holy Spirit and what Mr. Maurice teaches respecting the universal Reason, the 'Word at the root of our being,'—'the Light which,' as he applies the passage, 'lighteth every man which cometh into the world.' Not to make this discrimination was to omit the most practically important part of Dr. Mansel's self-chosen task,—to leave untouched the prevalent English form of the transcendentalism which he professes to refute.

But this omission is only consistent with the strain of the whole volume. There are very few things, according to Dr. Mansel, which we do know. He teaches us that 'the highest principles of thought and action to which we can attain, are regulative, not speculative; they do not serve to satisfy the reason, but to guide the conduct; they do not tell us what things are in themselves, but how we must conduct ourselves in relation to them.' (P. 93.) 'In religion,' we are told, 'God has given us truths which are designed to be regulative rather than speculative; intended not to satisfy our Reason but to guide our practice, not to tell us what God is in His Absolute Nature, but how He wills that we should think of Him in our present finite state;' (p. 94;) and, 'in philosophy as well as religion,' we are consistently taught, 'our highest principles of thought are regulative, not speculative.' Here we come in sight of the Lecturer's great distinction between truths regulative and speculative, a distinction to which we are introduced before the close of the fourth Lecture, and which forms the main subject of the fifth.

In the Lectures themselves, Dr. Mansel is not very explicit regarding the nature of this distinction. Although the senses which he attaches to the two words differ from those assigned to them by either Butler, or Kant, or Hamilton, he does not even define distinctly and expressly what he means by a speculative truth as distinguished from a regulative truth; neither does he give any examples of the former, though he gives many of the latter. Meanwhile he informs us that we can have no speculative knowledge, either in philosophy or in religion; nay that 'in religion, in morals, in our daily business, in the care of our lives, in the exercise of our senses, the rules which guide our practice cannot be reduced to principles which satisfy our reason.' (P. 89.) Under these circumstances, we cannot be surprised that Mr. Chretien, and others after him, arrived at the conclusion, that, according to Dr. Mansel's philosophy, man can attain to no knowledge of speculative truth, but must in all things be content with truth regulative; especially as the Lecturer informs us that 'Revelation is subject to no other limitations than those which encompass all human thought.'

It seems, however, that Mr. Chretien was more or less mistaken in his inference, though it was the result of a very careful and complete analysis. Dr. Mansel affirms that he does believe in the existence for man of speculative knowledge. By speculative knowledge, he means knowledge presented to us intuitively. Thus we have a speculative knowledge of form and colour, of ourselves, of the operations of our own mind. And the science of geometry, as founded on speculative knowledge, is a science the matter of which consists of speculative truth. But moral, political, and religious science belong, for the most part, and as regards their 'highest principles,' not to speculative but to regulative truth. (Preface, pp. xxiii.-xxix.)

This is the Lecturer's distinction. Let us see to what it brings us. I have a speculative knowledge of myself, but not of my personality; this latter is but a notion and a regulative truth. I have a speculative knowledge of my thoughts and feelings; but only a regulative knowledge of my character, considered as the *tout ensemble* of my moral and mental qualities. I have a speculative knowledge of the person of my wife or child; but only a regulative knowledge of *them*. A mother has but an indirect, analogical, and regulative knowledge of her son.

We can have a speculative and scientific knowledge of any subject only when, and to such an extent as, we have direct intuitions which may serve as its foundation. 'Physical science is possible, if the senses present us with material phenomena, whose relations and laws thought may investigate. Moral

science is possible, if we are presented with the fact of moral approbation and disapprobation of this or that action, in itself, and for its own sake; and the question for thought to investigate is, Whence do these feelings arise, and on what laws are they dependent? Æsthetical science is again possible as a distinct branch of inquiry, if the emotions arising from the contemplation of beauty and the works of nature or of art can be shown to be distinct from any communicated by their mere relation to the senses. And metaphysics must be submitted to the same criterion.'

So says Dr. Mansel in his *Prolegomena Logica*, (p. 35.) and the whole section from which this extract is taken throws great light upon the principles of the Lectures. Dr. Mansel, we have no doubt, believes, not only in the possibility of physical, but, to some extent, also, of æsthetical science, as founded upon the appropriate intuitions. In certain moral intuitions also we have seen that he believes, in a feeling of dependence and a sense of moral obligation; and accordingly he admits the possibility of a certain limited moral science to be founded on these intuitions as a basis. But he does not believe in that amount or description of intuitive knowledge of God which the Scriptures teach to be the Christian's privilege. Hence he admits nothing more than an analogical, indirect, regulative knowledge of God. Whereas, if the doctrines of experimental Christianity are true, the believer in Christ has a direct though limited knowledge of God through consciousness and spiritual intuition. According to the teaching of the Scripture there are two sources of our direct knowledge of God. We know Him through Christ. In reading the words of the Son, and meditating on His actions, our hearts and consciences intuitively recognise the Divine love, power, and glory, which belong to Him; and in Him we behold and know the Father. 'Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known Me, Philip? He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father.' (John xiv. 9.) 'This is life eternal, to know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.' (John xvii. 3.) 'God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give us the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.' (2 Cor. iv. 6.) In all this there seems to be much more than a merely regulative and analogical knowledge of God. The other source of our direct and intuitive knowledge of God is the Holy Spirit. The things which 'eye hath not seen, nor ear heard,' and which have never 'entered into the heart of man,' are 'revealed unto us by His Spirit;' (1 Cor. ii. 9, 10;) that Spirit which 'receives of the things which are Christ's, and

shows them unto us;' (John xvi. 15;) and thus by the 'spiritual man' the 'things of the Spirit of God' are 'spiritually discerned.' (1 Cor. ii. 14, 15.) What can all these passages mean, if they do not imply spiritual intuitions as a part of the life of Christian believers? Is all this nothing? And is there no 'unction from the Holy One?' (1 John ii. 20.) But all this, the true life of the Christian, all these spiritual intuitions, Dr. Mansel ignores, if he does not by implication deny them.

The mother, indeed, in our judgment, has something more than a merely regulative knowledge of her son's character. There are intuitions at play in their mutual intercourse, which amount to knowledge, direct and sure. But much more has the Christian a direct or intuitive knowledge of his Father God.

No one, except a German transcendentalist, supposes that we know the essence of Deity, what is His nature, and how He subsists. We know not this much of ourselves, as Dr. Mansel has repeated again and again. But as, nevertheless, we do *know something* of ourselves, so also we do know something about God. We have a true, but not an adequate knowledge. If we only know that of which we have pierced and laid open the essence, and all whose powers and properties are within our view, then indeed we know nothing whatever. True, Dr. Mansel would perhaps say, we do know nothing but *Phenomena*, not realities; and our highest science is but the science of Phenomena. Be it so; yet Phenomena we do know; and in knowing Phenomena, we know Being, not as the Maker knows it, but yet truly; otherwise, to know my feelings would be to know nothing about myself. Let me know the Phenomena,—that is, the properties, the mind and will and love, of the great God,—and I do know HIM. Here, again, we should have had pleasure in introducing some quotations from Dr. Young's volume, which we did not read till after the foregoing was written, but which singularly accord even with the phraseology we have employed. Our limits, however, compel us to cancel the extracts, and we can only refer our readers to pages 237, 238, 241, and 242, of the *Province of Reason*.

We suspect, however, that when Dr. Mansel professes to explain in his new Preface what speculative knowledge and truth man has within his power, he is hardly dealing in full frankness with us. After all, we cannot help concluding, Mr. Chretien was not far wrong when he drew the inference that Dr. Mansel does not believe in the attainability of speculative truth at all; at least, for man in his present sphere, if not for any finite mind. We doubt whether, rigidly pressed, Dr. Mansel would not be

obliged to concede that what in his Preface he has defined to be speculative knowledge, is but the knowledge of regulative truth. So far as the teaching of the Lectures themselves is concerned, we are inclined to think that Mr. Chretien's conclusion is fairly sustainable.

If by speculative knowledge we are to understand 'principles which satisfy the reason,' then, in a quotation which has been already given, we are distinctly taught that no such principles can be attained by us even in 'the exercise of our senses.' We use our senses; there is intuitive presentation; there are correspondent conceptions; but there is no absolute truth attained. 'The very perception of our senses,' we are taught, brings us face to face with seeming contradictions. (P. 91.) What is *body*, we do not and cannot know. (P. 90.) What we reach even in the exercise of our senses is, after all, but regulative truth, if the same rule of judgment is to be applied to this department as to the department of moral and religious knowledge.*

Neither as to our personality does Dr. Mansel really allow that our speculative knowledge gives us anything beyond regulative truth. 'We are compelled to regard ourselves and our fellow-men as *persons*, and the visible world around us as made up of *things*; but what is *personality*, and what is *reality*, are questions which the wisest have tried to answer, and have tried in vain.' (Page 89.) We know, *i. e.*, we *feel*, our sensations and emotions as they rise; but we know not *what* they are, nor whence they come, nor what constitutes personality.

As to all these matters, and as to all human knowledge whatsoever, Dr. Mansel teaches that the necessary conditions of human thought—what he calls the 'limitations' or 'restrictions' of *personality*, *space*, and *time*—operate as barriers against our attaining to speculative truth, and 'suggest, as their obvious explanation,'—O, painful, lamentable, and perplexing conclusion!—'the hypothesis of a mind cramped by its own laws, and bewildered in the contemplation of its own forms.' (P. 93.) Surely, then, Mr. Chretien's conclusion is fully borne out.

But morality is a higher sphere than sense or even intellect. May we not here, at least, attain to some pure and unrefracted truth? When the conscience has to deal with right and wrong, with sin and holiness; the immortal soul with the things not of

* That we do not attain to absolute, ultimate, complete truth, as regards the outer world of sense, all admit. What Sir William Hamilton, 'natural realist' as he has called himself, contended for was, that we are in the presence, within this sphere, of relative truth. He, however, did not maintain the coincidence of relative with real truth. Dr. Reid did; and so does Dr. McCosh.

time, but of eternity; not with shadows, but with substance; not with the images of sense, but with the 'things of the Spirit;' is there nothing real, stable, certain here? Our senses may only tell us what we need to know here; they may give us but superficial and relative knowledge: that is not a matter of the gravest concern; soon we shall have done with them. It matters little, too, if we cannot define our personality; and little, comparatively, even that we cannot clear away the perplexities which surround the question of moral liberty. But our *character* is *ourselves*; that must endure. When we have 'shuffled off this mortal coil,' then our moral selves will be in the presence of God, in the light of eternity. Our conscience owns no essential relation to the mere lights and shadows of this lower world; but it stands in living relation to the eternal moral God. Surely we may attain in this sphere to some abiding essential truth. Is there for us, as immortal spirits, here and now, no 'kingdom that cannot be shaken,' but shall still endure when the storms and changes of time are past?

Kant held that there was; he drew a sharp contrast between all other truth, which he held to be merely what Dr. Mansel calls 'Regulative,' and moral truth, which he held to be Absolute. The Lecturer charges him with inconsistency in this. We doubt the inconsistency. He did but change where the sphere and circumstances were entirely changed. If he were inconsistent, we say, with Dr. Young, that it was a noble inconsistency. We only lament that he did not become inconsistent earlier in his course and from a lower point in his system. But Sir William Hamilton, too, seems to be equally open to the charge of inconsistency, if there be any inconsistency in the case. He quotes, with approval and admiration, Kant's words on this point. He founds his theistic argument mainly on the assumed correspondence between what we may call the ideal or intuitive morality of the human conscience and the moral nature of God. Dr. Mansel not only abandons the teachings of the ancients, the noble doctrine of Cudworth, the general sense of Christian moralists, but rejects the philosophy of his own masters, in order to invest with a cloud of doubt and confusion those primal intuitions which are the very source of moral science. We need hardly say that, as to this point, the philosophy of Dr. M'Cosh is in direct antagonism to that of Dr. Mansel.*

* Dr. Mansel's principle is, that 'moral obligation, conceived as a law binding upon man, must be regarded as immutable so long as man's nature remains unchanged; but that human morality, even in its highest elevation, is not identical with the absolute morality of God.' (Pp. 134, 135.) Dr. M'Cosh, on the contrary, says,—and surely all

We confess that we agree with Mr. Maurice in opposition to Dr. Mansel upon this point; that we regard the incarnation of Deity in the person of Jesus Christ as decisive of the question. In Him was incarnated the Absolute Goodness, the Divine Morality. It is in vain, so we think, in presence of this great fact, to argue that 'human morality, even in its highest elevation,' is not coincident with the absolute morality of God. (P. 135.) And against such a fact as this the poor fallacy will never avail, that each precept of morals, as conceived by man and as applied to human circumstances, must take a form which cannot be supposed adequately to represent a principle of action in the Divine Nature. This may well be granted; and yet it may be maintained that the self-same principle which, in the Divine procedures, takes a certain form and exhibits a peculiar aspect, takes a determinately modified form, and exhibits an appropriate aspect, when regarded as a principle of human morality. This fact is in no way inconsistent with the essential identity of motive and principle in Him who is the Fountain of Goodness, and in those whom He actuates and fills with His own Spirit. If the 'mind of Christ' may be formed in Christian believers; if they may put on 'the new man,' and be made 'new creatures in Christ Jesus,' then it cannot be denied that Christian believers can be transformed into the moral image of the Father, and be filled and actuated by the essential principles of His goodness, without denying that the incarnate Son was in the moral likeness of the Eternal Father.

The principles on which Dr. Mansel has argued that man can never attain to anything more than a regulative knowledge of God, lead him farther than he seems willing to follow. *Personality and time, (i. e., duration and succession,)* if not also *space*, are conditions of thought not merely for human and earthly, but for all finite minds. Hence we cannot but infer that, according to Dr. Mansel's philosophy, angels and glorified saints, no less than men below, must labour in vain to attain to absolute and speculative truth; their intelligence, too, is 'cramped by its own laws,' and 'bewildered by its own forms.' Scripture, indeed, assures us that in a better state 'we shall see God as He is;' that we who now 'see through a glass darkly,' shall then 'see face to face,' that we who 'know' but 'in part,' shall then 'know also as we are known.' Dr. Mansel, too, himself, when he forgets his thorough-going philosophy, adopts

hearts, not sophisticated by a perverse logic, must go with his words,—'Virtue never can be vice, nor vice virtue. The distinction between right and wrong is not a mere personal conviction: we feel that it holds good not only for ourselves, but for others, for all intelligent and moral beings.'—*Method, &c.* p. 297.

this doctrine as his own. Not only does he in his Preface, where the tone is too dubious and hypothetically concessive to be of much value, speak of 'the possible apprehension of an Infinite Being by an intelligence superior to his own;' but, in the peroration to his Lecture V., he uses such glowing words as those which follow:—

'The time may indeed come, though not in this life, when these various manifestations of God "at sundry times and in divers manners" may be seen to be but different sides and partial representations of one and the same Divine Reality; when the light which now gleams in restless flashes from the ruffled waters of the human soul, will settle into the steadfast image of God's face shining in its unbroken surface.'—Pp. 107, 108.

But nearly at the close of his last Lecture he employs language which, to the common apprehension, would seem to shut out all hope that such a time as that just described can ever come.

'The adaptation,' he says, 'for which I contend, is one which exists in relation to the whole human race, as men, bound by the laws of man's thought; as creatures of time, instructed in the things of eternity; as finite beings, placed in relation to the Infinite.'—Page 171.

True it is that in the next sentence he implies that things may be altered when we cease to be 'men upon earth,' and become as 'the angels in heaven.' But surely angels are creatures of time,—at least, not partakers of the Divine Eternity; 'finite creatures placed in relation to the Infinite.' 'I believe,' proceeds the Lecturer, 'that "now we see through a glass darkly,"—in an enigma; but that *now* is one which encompasses the whole race of mankind, from the cradle to the grave, from the creation to the day of judgment.' But surely our humanity and finiteness will continue after the day of judgment as well as until that day; they will last for ever. For ever, therefore, according to Dr. Mansel's philosophy,—not according to St. Paul's teaching,—we are to see only 'through a glass darkly.'

In reply to a powerful and well-put objection of Julius Müller's against the conclusion to which the Lecturer has brought us,—that we can have no direct knowledge of God,—the Lecturer brings forward a parallel from philosophy. 'It is clear,' says the German philosopher, 'into what a strange position theology must fall by the renunciation of the knowledge of its essential object.' Dr. Mansel urges that, as regards the principle of Causality, which lies at the foundation of philosophy, we are as much in the dark as in regard to the nature of Deity. And yet this principle, he argues, 'is to the philosopher

what the belief in the existence of God is to the theologian.' Surely this is a very strange and low and unworthy view of the relation of God to theology. Here is the essential distinction and contrast between the two cases. Man must love God and enter into spiritual communion with Him. *This* principle lies at the foundation not only of all religion, but in truth of all theology. The philosopher has no need to hold communion with the principle (or notion ?) of Causality; the love of causality, and some sort of knowledge of it in itself, does not lie at the basis of his philosophy. It is sufficient for all the purposes of his science to take Causality to be the unknown cause of certain cognizable effects. But it is shocking and distressing for a Christian philosopher to hint that it is enough for Christian theologians to have a similar knowledge, or rather a similar ignorance, of their God.

Dr. Mansel, in his sixth and seventh Lectures, applies his distinction between speculative and regulative knowledge to ward off objections against Revelation. If pressed with what may be called rational objections to the doctrines of Revelation,—objections founded upon the seeming or supposed repugnancy of the revealed doctrines to the dictates of human reason or the inferences of the human understanding,—he replies in general that our conceptions of the Divine doctrines, and the representations of them given to us in Scripture, being of necessity only regulative, not strictly and absolutely but only relatively true, true up to a certain point, true in certain respects, analogies or shadows of the ultimate truth adapted to our limited faculties and conditions, we cannot argue from contradictions which may emerge among these conceptions that there are any contradictions in the real and Divine things of which they are representative. Now of course there is much truth in this general argument. What is needed is, that we should have limits defined within which it is fully and entirely applicable, beyond which it is but partially applicable. Every one feels that there is much truth in it; but every one also feels that it will not do to apply it indiscriminately and universally to every subject about which Scripture may have made, or may be supposed to have made, certain revelations. Every orthodox Protestant feels that such an argument must hold good as to the Trinity in Unity. Every Romanist would likewise use it in behalf of the dogma of transubstantiation. But the Protestant denies its applicability in the latter instance. What was wanted was a just criterion; this criterion Dr. Mansel's book has failed to supply. The tests which it furnishes (in the third Lecture) only serve to classify subjects, distinguishing between those which are wholly within, and those which are more or less

beyond the province of reason. What we want is some rules or principles by which to discriminate to what extent reason may pronounce, and where it must cease to utter its judgment, in regard to subjects which are partly within and partly beyond the province of reason.

The Lecturer, however, does not content himself with the general argument to which we have now referred. In illustration of the merely regulative character of even our philosophical knowledge, he brings forward, in his sixth Lecture, a number of problems which he considers insoluble, as to the One and Many, the relation of an Infinite substance to its Attributes, the co-existence of the Infinite and Finite, &c. We cheerfully acknowledge that in these discussions there is much profound thought, and that some of the philosophical analogies adduced by the Lecturer in extenuation of theological difficulties, are exceedingly instructive. But we must confess that we do not feel as safe in accompanying the Lecturer as we could like. If we are sensible now and again that a profound remark or a suggestive analogy has instructed us, we feel full as often as if we were being cheated by word-play, and not led along the processes of a real argument. One instance of this only can we afford space to mention. In reply to the Unitarian objection against the plurality of Persons in one Essence, he produces, as a counter-difficulty, the inconceivability of a plurality of Attributes in the Divine Essence,—the impossibility of conceiving how one Infinite substance should possess many Infinite Attributes,—because these many Infinities would be equal to One Infinite. The foundation of this wretched sophism is a fallacy, which we have already had occasion more than once to point out,—the covert assumption that the Infinite represents, whenever used, an entity *per se*; that it has a fixed and so to speak mathematical value—whereas, in fact, it is but a predicate, a negative predicate—implying, as used in reference to Deity, the absolute perfection of the entire Divine Nature, and likewise, in itself and for its own ends, the absolute Perfection of each Divine Attribute or Quality. We greatly deplore that an attempt should be made to fortify the doctrine of the Divine Trinity against rationalistic objections by a cobweb-curtain of such sophistries as these. Commend us rather to the old arguments of Waterland and Pearson. These divines knew how to *use* scholastic logic in defence of Divine doctrine, but they did not lay themselves open to trenchant rejoinder by such arguments as these.

It will be easily understood in what way Dr. Mansel makes use of his principle of the non-identity of the Divine or Absolute, and of human morality, to meet a certain class of arguments

which have been directed against Revelation. To every supposed moral objection against revealed doctrine or precept, his answer is, 'We are no judges of absolute morality; morality in God, the ultimate morality, may be something very different from our human conception of it.' We need not say that we deem this very perilous ground to take. Truly, indeed, it behoves us to avoid presumptuous judgment of the Divine procedures. It may well be said that the right or wrong in many questions of the Divine Government may be different from that which would seem right or wrong to us. Not, however, because the principles of morality, as revealed to us in Scripture, are at all different from the principles of Divine and Absolute morality,—but because we cannot understand all the circumstances of the case,—because we cannot get as high as the Divine throne,—because our horizon is not as wide as the universe,—because we cannot see the end from the beginning. Children often cannot fully understand or rightly judge the moral principles which regulate their parents' conduct; how much less we those of our Heavenly Father! To Job's *mere understanding* at first the course of Divine Providence seemed even unjust; yet afterwards he was brought to see its righteousness. Butler is on this point, as Dr. Young has well reminded us, entirely opposed to Dr. Mansel, who has aptly and impressively quoted in his favour many passages from the great apologist, but in reality has widely departed from the reigning spirit of the bishop's immortal treatise.

'Referring to disputed commands in the Old Testament, he says, "none of these precepts are contrary to immutable morality." Immutable morality! He holds that we can know it and judge what is and what is not contrary to it. The Bampton Lecturer could not have employed the phrase, for he distinctly maintains that we cannot know it.—*Province of Reason*, p. 275.

As to the manner in which the Lecturer, still carrying out his argument in the same strain, deals with the Atonement, and the associated doctrines of evangelical Theology, we cannot do better than quote the following passage from Dr. Young.

'Only in a passing sentence or two, shall I notice the peculiar method in which the Lecturer defends the mysteries of Christianity, the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement. It is well known, that objectors against these doctrines have been wont to assert that they are not only incomprehensible, but directly contradictory. The answer of the Lecturer amounts to a free admission of all the alleged contradictions. It is even so, he would say, but the objection has no validity as applied to the Christian revelation; for it is only common to it with all philosophy and with all the efforts of

reason, when directed to the nature of God, or to His procedure with His creatures, or to His purposes and methods. We cannot reason upon them without being plunged into contradictions without end. We have no right to reason upon them at all. They belong to the region of faith—they are to be accepted unconditionally. The Infinite and all that relates to the Infinite is not an object of human thought. We have no business to think, we are utterly incapable of conceiving anything at all on the subject.

‘It is little likely, that accomplished and earnest theologians, in our own or in any other country, will be found willing to accept of this kind of shelter for doctrines, which they hold dear. Time was, when the battle of the faith was fought on other and far nobler ground, and erudite and able men contended, triumphantly contended, that that which they admitted to be altogether incomprehensible, could not be shown to be contradictory. *That* time, one may piously hope, is not yet past. Meanwhile, so far as the Bampton Lecturer is concerned, those who have separated themselves from Christianity, are completely triumphant, and have had conceded to them all that they ever contended for. They have always alleged, they do now allege, that Christianity has no foundation in reason, cannot stand on the ground of reason. The Lecturer simply acknowledges the fact. In his view, Christianity is *as* full of *as* insoluble contradictions, as he imagines philosophy to be. But it does not seem to occur to him, that in such a case, wisdom would teach us, not to adopt the one, because it is no worse than the other, but to reject both, for the same reason.

‘I see an alternative, one, only one—either to yield unconditionally to authority and throw ourselves into the arms of an infallible Church, or in blank despair, to enshroud and entomb ourselves amidst all the horrors of a universal scepticism.’—*Province of Reason*, pp. 279–282.

Our limits are already far exceeded. We have no space left for favourable quotation. There are many pages of rich and eloquent thought which it would have been a pleasure to lay before our readers. The book, however, is, at least through Mudie, accessible to every student. We have aimed at supplying those theological students who do us the honour of consulting this *Review* with what may serve at once as key and as corrective, so that the younger and less experienced among them may not read simply to be bewildered and darkened. Such a book, at once so modern and so retrogressive, so daring in thought and yet so servile in spirit, so scholastic and so brilliant, so sceptical in its philosophy and so devout in its religious tone, could only have been produced in Oxford. Our total judgment of the work cannot be better expressed than in the following sentences.

‘I distrust Mr. Mansel’s premises; I am comparatively indifferent to his conclusions,’ [where these are positive and seem to be true.]^t

'The former belong to the most cloudy region of metaphysics; the latter barely descend to the point at which the evidences of Christ begin. Those "middle axioms" among which are stored the most valuable results of human knowledge, lie quite below the level of his investigations. He pursues real or supposed errors into the cloud of contradictions, and brings back a negation as a proof of victory. In the endeavour to overthrow a few extraordinary falsehoods, he is in danger of sapping the foundations of ordinary truth.'—*Chretien's Letter*, p. 40.

We should be pleased to think that Oxford might one day furnish a divine to accomplish wisely and justly that which Dr. Mansel has failed in the attempt to do—'to fix the limits of religious thought.' The conception was a noble one, and worthy of Dr. Mansel's capabilities and accomplishments. We lament that the performance has so sadly failed. We fear, however, that Oxford divines are not likely greatly to advance sound Christian science, however ably they may often expound and defend ancient Christian doctrines. There seems to be little choice at that University between Tradition and Authority on the one hand, and Scepticism on the other, unless, as in the case of Dr. Newman and (we must now add) Dr. Mansel, both these extremes are represented in the same speculations. Dr. Hampden's Lectures, indeed, whatever grave faults may attach to them, undoubtedly did something in the way of aiding the progress of a scientific theology, with what results to Dr. Hampden himself, (whom, however, we would by no means undertake to defend on all points,) we need not remind our readers. The present volume is really a much more powerful solvent of existing beliefs, it is far more deeply sceptical in its tendency, than Dr. Hampden's; but as it is not merely conservative, but retrogressive, in its tone, and (let us also admit) quickened by passages of fervid and impressive doctrinal eloquence, interspersed amid the tracts of thorny dialectics, like flowery summer glades shining among forest thickets; as it contains, also, powerful criticisms of existing heresies; Dr. Mansel's Lectures have been welcomed at Oxford by applause as universal and echoing as the discord of dissent and condemnation which awoke on the delivery of the famous Lectures of the present Bishop of Hereford.*

* In the comparatively humble, but yet exceedingly valuable, walk of inquiry, to which, according to his summing up in his eighth and last Lectures, Dr. Mansel would almost exclusively limit the labours of Christian Apologists,—that of the external evidences, we gladly welcome the instructive volume of Dr. Rawlinson, the Bampton Lecturer for 1859, on the 'Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Sacred Records.'

- ART. V.—1. *Ragged Homes, and How to mend them.* By MRS. BAYLY. London: Nisbet and Co. 1860.
2. *The Missing Link: or, Bible Women in the Homes of the London Poor.* By L. N. R., Author of 'The Book and its Story.' Nisbet. 1859.
3. *Haste to the Rescue: or, Work while it is Day.* By MRS. CHARLES WIGHTMAN. Nisbet. 1860.
4. *The Ways of the Line: a Monograph on Excavators.* Edinburgh: William Oliphant and Co. 1858.

THE day when woman believed her work to be limited by the number of her rooms, the walls of her garden, or even the remotest dwelling in the neighbouring street or hamlet, seems to have passed by. No longer content with clothing her children, cooking her husband's dinner, and carrying food and medicine to her sick or starving neighbours, she now sets herself to great social reforms. Her head aches over plans of usefulness, and her hand wearies itself with the working of curiously involved moral machinery. We boast that in this age woman is free and useful and honoured; that her way is opening for gaining an independent livelihood by handicraft and intellectual effort; and that her voice is listened to with more than tolerance,—with admiring approval, on topics which our fathers would have heard her speak of with a sneer. But how far are we to go in this direction? Is there no danger of woman's stepping beyond the just line of graceful and appropriate occupation? Can we feel gratified by seeing one lady come forward on the platform of a large public assembly to read her own written thoughts as to female employment, or another seat herself at a table to expound the Scriptures before a mixed audience? In her *Notes on Nursing*, Miss Nightingale says: 'You do not want the effect of your good things to be, How wonderful for a woman! Nor would you be deterred from good things by hearing it said, Yes, but she ought not to have done this, because it is not suitable for a woman. But you want to do the thing that is good, whether it is suitable for a woman or not. It does not make a thing bad which would have been good had a man done it, that it has been done by a woman.' Strange reasoning this, and unsafe teaching. A good thing may be done even sinfully, as in a whole class of cases where a right action is done from a wrong motive. And surely there are many things good in themselves, and for the doing of which suffering humanity cries aloud, which yet a woman must be content to leave undone, just because she is not the proper person to do them. It is good to

plead in defence of a falsely-accused virtuous man ; good to fight for one's country ; good to amputate a limb hopelessly injured or diseased ; good to plough and dig ;—yet who among us thinks that woman ought to enter the lists with our barristers, soldiers, surgeons, or farm labourers ? The power to do any given good work cannot be in itself the warrant for doing it. Indeed, the consciousness of latent power which no call of duty has ever brought into action, and the persuasion that during an uncertain period, perhaps through all the years of a long life, an instructed will must still repress its development, form one of the many hidden trials of man's earthly state.

To find one's own niche and to keep it, is to learn a valuable lesson ; not, with narrow positiveness, refusing all change, should some sudden emergency call to unwonted work ; but still less, with roving heart and eye, standing ever on the outlook for new enterprises, even should they be of questionable propriety. There is always a danger of setting up exceptional cases into models to be commonly copied. Because one woman has been led, by peculiar outward circumstances, not only to recognise within herself the power to do something beyond the beaten track, but also to do it with success, and the praise that waits on success, a hundred others, less gifted and self-called, follow in her footsteps, but miss her mark.

What is the New Testament's teaching as to woman's province ? We scarcely ever find her there an independent and busy public character. She is a 'helper,' a 'succourer ;' she is seen, how often, 'following' and 'ministering.' The favourite types under which we are wont to range all classes of Christian women are the sisters of Bethany. Here we have Martha,—most likely Simon's wife, certainly the mistress and manager of the home which our Saviour so often visited,—prompted by her reverent love to run hither and thither, that the best might be procured for her guest, and that best most attractively set out. One can imagine with what quickness of eye any failure in her handmaids would be observed ; with what decision of speech reproved. How dexterously would her apt fingers, by their rapid movements, secure the right effect ; and, when all was ready, with what matronly contentment would she survey her own work and wait upon her Lord ! And then we see Mary, the gentle maiden sister, retired and leisurely, more prone to sit brooding over a sorrow than to take one step to seek a comforter ; living less in the present than the future ; desiring to know the meaning of her Master's life on earth, and learning much from His own life ; the perfume of whose name is still precious as the costly ointment that she poured on His head

'against the day of His burying.' But not in these sisters only do we see women of home affections, quick sympathy, ready ministry, and great usefulness; many a hint given to others, sometimes in a single phrase, leads us to a strong opinion as to what woman should be. Mary, blessed among women, could spend three months in the hill country, pouring out her heart in free and congenial converse with her cousin Elizabeth; yet could she keep closely pent within that heart an untold treasure of thought and feeling. We see Anna, spending the long days of her widowhood in temple service, fasting, praying, and giving thanks; the mother of Simon's wife, rising from her sick bed to pay instant attention to her Healer and His friends; Mary Magdalene, lingering the latest near the cross, grateful for such a cure as only Omnipotent Love could have wrought, and going early in the morning, 'while it was yet dark,' her hands filled with sweet spices, that no office of friendship might be omitted; Dorcas, whose skill in needlework was so directed by a thoughtful charity, that at her premature death many a widow's heart owned in new grief how effectually an old wound had been healed by the hand of sisterly kindness; Lydia, whose joy it was to spend her well-earned wealth in making a happy home for Christ's messengers; Mary, the mother of Mark, in days of trouble and danger, opening her house for the midnight prayer-meeting, and welcoming there a constant company;—for when Peter was left without the angel's guidance, he went straight to the well-known meeting-place;—with Phoebe, the servant of the Church at Cenchrea, and many more, who either ministered to the Saviour of their substance, or who, approved by apostolic wisdom, were set apart to teach children, to care for strangers, and to relieve the sick. Sweet examples these of womanly character and work.

Woman's true position is that of humility and dependence; she is called to use influence rather than to exercise authority; and any course of action inconsistent with this position and calling should be shunned by her rather than coveted. M. Adolphe Monod, in his two discourses, as true in thought as they are elegant in style, on *La Femme, sa Mission et sa Vie*, says: 'Les épithètes prises de la vie publique honorent l'homme, mais flétrissent la femme à des degrés divers. Pour n'en citer que des exemples que la délicatesse de cette chaire autorise, essayez de dire une *femme savante*, une *grande femme*, une *femme d'affaires*, une *femme d'état*—autant parler d'un *homme de ménage*!' *

* These discourses should be read in the original, as in passing through the hands of the English translator they have lost much of their beauty and some of their sense.

Though woman may rebel against the doom that, for her sin, has made her subject, she cannot question the fact that before her fall and her punishment she was made secondary to man, made *for* him even in innocence and in Eden. Mrs. Schimmelpenninck says, in her paper on the destiny of woman:—‘We are expressly told in 1 Cor. xi. 9, that woman was created for the man, not man for the woman, confirming in the dispensation of the Spirit the testimony of the original history to this truth, that the destiny of woman is to be that of a helper; that she is not to stand alone, as possessing a self-sufficient existence, but to be secondary; a planet, not a sun. This character of helper then belongs to her under all circumstances. It was the destiny of her creation in Paradise, and it is never to be lost sight of. Whether as wife, daughter, sister, child, friend, or servant, the character of helper must be, as it were, the thread of gold running through the whole female character.....It is the woman’s crowning “glory” to be a helper, and every woman lets go her crown who does not stand fast in that glory with which the Lord Himself has invested her.’ This should be borne in mind by every woman before setting out in any path of usefulness. She deserves no blame for engaging in a new work,—a work for which she cannot plead approved female example,—if that work is consistent with the design of her Creator and the fulfilment of her own appointed destiny. But the question, ‘Is it a right kind of work for a woman?’ should instantly follow the conviction that such a work needs to be done. She may stir up others to do it, even though she should be reluctantly compelled to own that she herself must leave it undone. It has often been said, ‘Begin with the duty nearest you.’ All woman’s work must begin at home. She fulfils her highest mission when her children rise up and call her blessed, and when her husband praises her. As a wife, it is hers by gentle ministry, and ready tact, and prudent outlay, and wise counsel,—by showing herself

‘Swift to forgive and meek to suffer wrong,
Patient and yielding, but in duty strong,’

to make her husband happier and more honoured than he could have been without her; as a mother, she has the power to impress her own character and convictions upon coming generations; as a mistress, she may lead many a servant and

The translation is literal rather than idiomatic, and not always that. For example, in the sentence just quoted, ‘*à des degrés divers*,’ is rendered ‘to the same extent;’ and a page or two further on, speaking of a savage tribe, M. Monod is made to say, ‘Where woman has descended to the condition of the brute, and the men devour her between them.’ The French is, ‘*Les hommes se mangent entre eux*.’

sister to the feet of the common Saviour, having first won her heart by the attractions of a happy home. Neither is the unmarried woman exempt from the work of a helper. She has her own place in the family to fill; parents to please, or brothers and sisters to influence, or nephews and nieces to associate with as a cheerful companion and a kindly guide: or if she have none of these ties, but live apart, in some small cottage, with one little maid, that little maid should be her first care and charge. None is justified in going beyond home to find work, while conscious that the work of home is not properly done.

We believe that these words are not unneeded words. There is too much of likeness in the satirist's representative women to many who are widely praised for active charity. Does none of us know some Mrs. Jellyby, 'whose eyes have a curious habit of seeming to look a long way off,' and whose time is wholly occupied with one favourite project, 'involving an endless correspondence with public bodies and private individuals anxious for the welfare of their species,' while her dinner comes to table uncooked, and her children jam their heads in the railings of the area? Or some Mrs. Pardiggle, who might thus describe herself: 'I am a School lady, I am a Visiting lady, I am a Reading lady, I am a Distributing lady; I am on the Local Linen Box Committee, and many general Committees; and my canvassing alone is very extensive; perhaps no one's more so. You may have observed in some of the charitable lists that the names of my young family are concluded with the name of O. A. Pardiggle, F.R.S., one pound. That is their father. We usually observe the same routine. I put down my mite first; then my young family enrol their contributions, according to their ages and their little means; and then Mr. Pardiggle brings up the rear. Mr. Pardiggle is happy to throw in his limited donation; and thus things are made not only pleasant to ourselves, but, we trust, improving to others.' It were possible to instance more than one whose name has been handed down for eminent piety and extraordinary gifts, concerning whom there has been a parallel though private tradition, of husband slighted, children ill-trained, and home not kept. Woman's example is her most effectual mode of teaching.

But we do not mean to decry all womanly effort for improving the condition of society by a charity that stretches beyond the limits of home. Woman, ever remembering that she was first in the transgression, carries with her also the blessed knowledge that through her Christ came; and that, taught by Him, she may become 'a repairer of the breach, a restorer of paths to dwell in.' So, first at home, and then among those without, she

gladly invites wandering souls to return to shelter and safety. There are women whose claims at home are few; some who, having brought up a family, can give the evening of life to service in the Church; some, wives of overworked Ministers, whose supplementary services their husbands are glad to encourage: there are single women who have many hours of leisure after finishing their proper task; and there are, it must be owned, married women with children clustering around them, who, by superior energy and superior management, can and do contrive to press a vast amount of work into a short space of time, and to guide and govern with half the trouble of other people. These without sacrifice of womanly propriety are yet able to add to home duty the care of their neighbourhood, or the direction of numerous subordinate agents. Such efficient and gifted fellow-workers are followed with silent homage and many blessings.

Looking at the books named at the head of this paper, we are first attracted by Mrs. Bayly's *Ragged Homes, and How to mend them*. The title speaks for itself. Surely no work better befits a lady than an attempt to improve the home comforts of her neighbours. And none who has the leisure and the heart to set about this reform need go far to seek homes that want mending. Mrs. Bayly began her work in the Notting Dale Potteries; and there, with ceaseless painstaking and most encouraging success, she has laboured for the last six years. What those Potteries were, her pen has very plainly told.

Sixty years ago, the pig-feeding establishments of London were clustered together on ground now covered by the Marble Arch, Connaught Square, and those other newer squares attractive to the gentle and the wealthy. As the tide of London life poured westward, the original inhabitants, with their herds of swine, were forced to decamp, and to seek a settlement farther in the country. A chimney-sweep and scavenger, named Lake, secured a lease of a suitable plot of ground, and there he and his pigs had it all their own way for some years. However, having more land than he needed, and the distress of the West End pig-owners increasing, Lake encouraged the settling of a large number of sub-tenants, and was soon surrounded by a numerous colony. It will be guessed easily that the dwellings of these emigrants were irregular of aspect and wretched in provision for the wants of a family; indeed, sanatory arrangements were altogether dispensed with. 'Such things as drainage and fresh water were considered superfluous.' Thirty years passed away, and then an adjoining plot of ground was bought for brickmaking, and a new detachment of residents arrived; not a whit more reputable than Lake and his friends, if we may

believe an old woman whose parents were among the earliest inhabitants. 'Now pig-feeding is respectable; but them brick-people, they bean't, some of them, no wiser than the clay they works on.' How they lived, and in what plight the whole colony was found in 1856, is thus stated in the Report on the Sanatory Condition of the Parish of Kensington:—

'One of the most deplorable spots, not only in Kensington, but in the whole metropolis, is the Potteries at Notting Dale,—a locality which is from its position difficult to drain. It occupies eight or nine acres of ground, and contains about one thousand inhabitants, the majority of whom obtain a living by rearing and fattening pigs upon the house-refuse obtained from club-houses and hotels, and upon offal, entrails, liver, and blood from slaughter-houses. This offensive food, often in a high state of decomposition when brought to the place, is boiled down in coppers, and the fat separated for sale.

'The number of pigs varies from one thousand to two thousand, (as many as three thousand have been kept,) in filthy and badly-paved styres close to the houses. The drainage, in nearly all cases very defective, permits the liquid manure to run over the yards, saturating the ground to a great depth, contaminating all the wells with putrid matter, and polluting the atmosphere for a considerable distance around. There were, till lately, several immense accumulations of stagnant water into which this found its way. One immense piece, called the "Ocean," formerly occupied nearly an acre of ground; it was covered with filthy slime, and bubbling with poisonous gases, caused by the drainage of pig-styes, &c., flowing into it. Till lately, the want of water was most severely felt by the inhabitants; and even now many of the yards in which the pigs are kept are entirely destitute of it. Many of the houses are in a most dilapidated state. Old railway-carriages and worn-out travelling-vans may be seen taken off their wheels and converted into dwellings. The people in general are sallow and aged; the children pale and flabby, their eyes glistening as if stimulated by ammonia. Small-pox is ten times more fatal than in any of the surrounding districts.'—Page 30.

Better houses have been built since that time; but many of these are ill adapted to the needs and habits of the poor. Mrs. Bayly says:—

'One of the greatest obstacles which meets those who are striving to improve the homes of the poor is the construction of dwellings. There are whole streets of houses in the neighbourhood, whose appearance gives you the idea that they were originally designed for a higher class of people; and yet the builder must have known that the supply of such houses was already much beyond the demand, and that, if let at all, the inmates must be poor. Nothing, however, adapts them for this class of inhabitants. Five or six families may occasionally be found in one such house, with no more provision for health, comfort, and decency than ought to be made for each one.

'The houses professedly erected for the poor are still more deficient. They are sometimes built below the level of the road, so that the drainage is *to* them, instead of *from* them. The basements are consequently fearfully damp, and the whole atmosphere, in every part of the house, is impregnated with the effluvia from stagnant sewage.

'The materials used in building are so bad, and the workmanship so inferior, that the floors are always loose, and everything seems constantly getting out of order. We have whole streets of small six-roomed houses let out entirely to the poor; so that three families frequently live in one house. *There is no outlet to the air at the back of these dwellings, either by door or by windows.* One long blank wall is all that is to be seen. Frequent illness prevails among the inhabitants of these streets; and I can never forget the scenes presented there during the visitation of the cholera.....In a small bed-room on the top floor of one of these dwellings I found, one morning, that a woman and a child had died in the night; and another woman in the same room, though still living, appeared in a dying state. I shudder when I think of that room; no pen can describe its horrors. It was a close, hot morning in July; not a breath of air was stirring. The window was thrown up at the bottom; it could not be opened at the top; and as there was no draught through the house to draw the air into the room, very little relief could be obtained. The dying woman was the mother of little children, and I would have given anything to save her. The only possible expedient that suggested itself was to have some of the bricks forced out of the back wall. This was done; but all was in vain, the poor mother died, surviving only a few days; and the little children either cried in the street, or were cared for by a neighbour, till they were taken away to the workhouse.'—Page 240.

The lower classes are curiously fond of dirty warmth: they seem to have a notion that all the dangerous air is outside their small rooms; not within them. No crevice in the carpentry, no hole in the window-pane, is suffered to admit a breath of oxygen: that is excluded by paper and old rags. In rural districts we have seen labouring men come to an evening meeting in their working dress, after a long walk in a cutting winter's wind, or worse still, in soft, drizzling rain, and choose the places nearest the stove, crowding together around it, to the detriment of their clothes as well as their health. A ventilator in a village chapel is sure to excite discontent. For one air-seeking man who wishes to keep it open, twenty grumblers will be found anxious to have it shut. It seems desirable that all such mechanical aids to health should be cleverly concealed from the public eye, if they are to answer the end designed by their contrivers. Even those who should know better are apt to err here. Schoolmasters will shut the ventilator in winter lest the children should catch cold, and will teach for hours in an atmosphere so close and offensive, that the visitor who comes to the

door fresh from breathing the pure outer air, feels a natural repugnance to enter; and servants in respectable houses from which the objectionable chimney-board has long been banished, require narrow watching, or they will close the unseen register of the bedroom grate, lest soot should fall. The oppressive weight sometimes felt in first waking in the morning might be not unfrequently traced to this officious precaution of the housemaid. But to come back to the Potteries. Living in such wretched houses as have been described, can we wonder to find that the wives, who ought to be the managers of the family, are improvident and reckless?

‘The only means by which many of them get food for the winter is by pawning the little furniture that they have, or by “going on tick,”—in other words, by getting trust at the shops. Those, however, who manage to pay for their things as they buy them, do it in such a manner as to be little better off than under the “tick” system. The child is sometimes sent to the shop three times a day, to obtain the supplies for each meal as it is wanted. Of course the shopkeeper cannot give so much time, paper, and string, without being paid for them. After a careful calculation, I feel convinced, that, whether the poor man’s wants are supplied through the “tick system,” or the “hand-to-mouth system,” in either case he gets the value of only fourteen shillings for his pound.... When the mother has to go out to work that she may obtain the necessary food for herself and children, the effects to the family are most disastrous. On her return, wearied out in earning her hard-won half-crown, she finds that the baby has been crying for hours; (as well it might, poor thing!) that another child has been scalded by hot water from the kettle; that another, perhaps, has wandered away, and has not come home, and that she herself must go and seek for it; while the “little girl” left in charge of the whole is severely scolded, if not beaten, for her shortcomings. In the midst of all these annoyances the father returns, for the hundredth time, without having found work, exhausted and footsore in his fruitless search; and sorer still in spirit, as he feels that he is not wanted in the world, that the labour market has no demand for him, he enters the wretched hovel which he is obliged to call “home.” He hears the crying of the children, the scolding of the mother; and sees everywhere the destruction which children left to themselves cause. The wife throws her half-crown at him as he enters, crying, “There! much good may that do yer. Here’s a shilling’s worth of things broke,—Johnny’s coat is burnt, and Sally’s pinafore; the children have eat up the tea out of the paper; and yer’ll have to pay for a sight of doctoring afore this scalded leg is well.” A man already angry would, with less aggravation than this, return railing for railing; and so the angry words are given back again with interest. Blows occasionally follow, according to the temper of the moment, sometimes inflicted on the provoking wife, sometimes on the poor

victim whose negligence is supposed to have caused all these misfortunes. The cravings of hunger oblige some one at last to pick up the half-crown, and the girl is dispatched with many threats to the nearest places where bread and cheese and porter can be procured, and charged at the same time to get "two penn'orth of gin" to give to the baby to make it sleep. This expensive food consumes the greater part of the half-crown. Three pennyworth of bread, two pennyworth of vegetables, two pennyworth of barley or rice, and four pennyworth of meat *well-cooked*, would have supplied all the family with a good nourishing supper, leaving something for the midday meal of the morrow;...but in their excited state it is not food they care for so much as something that will make them sleep and forget. So they drink the porter, and the baby has the gin, and, in spite of the moan of the scalded child, they sleep,—but in such an atmosphere, surrounded with such dirt within and stench without, that should they all awake with burning fever the next morning, no one can wonder. They tell me that on the mornings after such nights, they suffer from intense depression; so much so, that whatever remains of the half-crown is spent on drink, in order to drag themselves up to a repetition of their daily toil. Now, the earnings of the family just described (for I have drawn a picture from real life) averaged for five months in the summer, £2. 10s. per week. They could, of course, have lived very well upon twenty-five shillings. If we reckon 10s. for paying off old scores, buying new clothes, furniture, and sundries, there would still be 15s. left, which might have been put into the Savings' Bank to meet the demands of the ensuing winter. But instead of doing this, the man in his distress confessed to me that the cost of what he and his wife drank each week of their prosperity would amount to at least a pound. The usual quantity of beer that a brickmaker takes during the hours of work is seven pints. This expenditure is looked upon as simply necessary: and when money is plentiful, there must be the drinking for luxury as well as necessity.'—Page 64.

Let such scenes as Mrs. Bayly has here drawn from the life be repeated a few times, and the habit of drinking is established. Then comes the pawn-shop.

One of the inhabitants of the Potteries, a hard-working man, and a 'teetotaller,' whose intelligence makes his testimony valuable, gave the following reply to Mrs. Bayly, when she asked him how it was that so many working men had such wretched homes: 'The drink seems the chief thing; but there is many a man that would not drink, if he could bear himself without it. There are so many women who don't seem to know how to manage no more than nothing; and when *they* take to drinking and going to the pawn-shop, then there is nothing but misery for them all. There's many a woman in our place who has only one decent gown, and that's 'most always in the pawn-shop; she just gets it out of a Saturday night, when the money comes in,

and by Monday sometimes the money is a'most gone, and she puts it in again. Some of our poor fellows have got but one shirt; and I have known a man give it to his wife on Monday morning to wash, and she has taken it off to the pawn-shop, and got some drink with the money she got. Sometimes, when the wife does try to go on right, the man don't: he takes to all the bad ways, and leads her a dog's life: it's only when they both pull one way that it all goes right.' Mrs. Bayly says:—

'The climax of evil in a woman is the habit of drinking. There are many more drunkards among men than among women, certainly; but whilst I have known many men reform, I have known but very few women amend, after having fallen into this horrid vice. Whether it be that a woman who has given way to intemperance feels so utterly degraded and out of place as to be hopeless of ever righting herself again, and that she consequently proceeds desperately from bad to worse, I cannot tell; but certainly the effects of this vice upon herself, her husband, and her family, are terrible in the extreme. No tongue can express what the child of the drunken mother suffers.... Two wretched little children, almost destitute of clothes, came to my door one bitterly cold day. The very sight of them made my children cry; and, contrary to my judgment, (for, alas! experience has made me wise,) I allowed them to dress them in warm woollen jackets. Not many yards from the door, the mother was waiting for them: she took them at once to the pawn-shop, stripped the little shivering ones of the only warm garments they had known for many a day, disposed of them for a trifle, and got drunk with the money. The next day the sufferings of one of these children were happily closed by death. I say, happily; for death is the only release,—a release to be desired beyond everything for the drunken mother's child.'—Pp. 72, 136.

It was to mend such homes and such mothers that Mrs. Bayly determined to devote time and effort. A worthy Curate was already at work in the Potteries, and a City Missionary had also commenced a course of valuable labour; but something specific might be done for those poor women who were truly said to 'know how to manage no more than nothing.' So she resolved on beginning with a weekly Mothers' Meeting; and having provided a pleasant, well-lighted room, she invited the attendance of her poor neighbours, and began her work on the first Monday evening of November, 1853. Not quite twelve attended on that first occasion. Mrs. Bayly read a few verses of Scripture, to which they listened with fair attention; but as soon as her voice dropped, they began to talk; and on they went, louder and faster, for some time, their entertainer purposely keeping silence. As soon as a lull succeeded to the clamour, Mrs. Bayly told

them that she had something to say, and again they sat mute. On catching the idea that her aim was to improve their domestic affairs, they turned instantly from themselves to their acquaintances in the Potteries. Such a neighbour 'served her children dreadful.' One ugly story followed another, none seeming to feel that her own case needed mending, though this naïve confession fell from one mother's lips: 'I'm always a trying to do 'em good, and telling 'em what they should do; but instead of doing it, they jist up and sarce at me in a minit.' When the hour was over, Mrs. Bayly, feeling secretly persuaded that the Pharisees before her were unlikely to return, begged them to send to the next meeting 'those very wicked neighbours of theirs.' Each evening that succeeded found the little company becoming less, till on the fourth Monday Mrs. Bayly was the only person present. This proved to be a critical and a memorable evening. We will let Mrs. Bayly tell her own story.

'The general arrangements of the room had been even more than usually carefully attended to, through the thoughtfulness of our kind City Missionary. It was well lighted, and the fire burned cheerfully. My chair was placed in a chosen spot, and a Bible lay on the table before it: but no one came. I opened the Bible and read; and though I cannot give any effect to this narrative by speaking of the remarkable appropriateness of the passage that happened to fix my attention, I distinctly remember losing, under the influence of its holy power, all sense of vexation and disappointment; and the solitude soon appeared in the light of a most favourable opportunity for praying, long and earnestly, for those I so much desired to serve. I felt perfectly resigned to God's will; either to fit me for it, to raise up others, or to give me to see clearly that this was not the work He had appointed me to do. About a quarter of an hour before the time of closing, a woman came in with a bottle of medicine in her hand. She had been coming to the meeting, but her husband had been taken ill, which had obliged her to go in search of medicine for him instead. On her return, she thought that she would just step in and see how we were getting on. I had noticed that this poor woman had shown more interest than any that had yet attended; and I was glad of an opportunity of becoming better acquainted with her. She told me that her husband had formerly been an infidel; but through a tract left at the house, combined with the visits of the Missionary, he had become an entirely changed character. She described with great simplicity how the alteration gradually manifested itself; how, at first, he did not like her to see him praying; and how she took care to keep out of the way at the time. Then he came to praying before her, and then with her and the children; and now, no day passed without their united supplications ascending to the Author of their mercies. Then followed the description of what John used to be, and what he was; what the house was then, and now. I never felt more emphatically

that "Surely I know it shall be well with them that fear God, which fear before Him;" and that the only cure for the sting of poverty was that every family should be governed by the principles which influenced this. I need hardly add, that the meeting that night was for my benefit.'—Page 114.

Six weeks after, the number of matrons who attended the meeting had risen to twenty-five; and it continued to increase till Mrs. Bayly found it impossible to carry on the work single-handed. Several ladies offered their help, and a Society was organized. The plan of the meetings is to commence with reading the Scriptures and prayer. Then money affairs are settled; for many of the women are glad to deposit small sums in a Savings' Bank established to assist them in forming habits of economy and forethought. Afterwards materials for work are supplied at a reduced price, and good patterns free of charge; so that the women's fingers are busily and usefully employed in making garments for themselves and their children, while the presiding lady guides the conversation of the hour. This relates to matters of home interest, and is varied according to the little experiences of daily life. Sometimes hints as to cooking, so as to produce the best results that small means will allow, are given; sometimes the way to amuse children is suggested; and Mrs. Bayly does not forget to bid them open their windows, if they wish their homes to be healthy. One evening she gave them a lesson on pure air and ventilation. Calling some months afterwards at a house where two of the poor mothers lived, she was struck with its clean aspect, and fresh, well ventilated atmosphere. 'Ah!' said one of the women, 'that was a wonderful evening when you told us all about what air we could live upon, and what we couldn't. I says to Mrs. L., as we were going home, "There now, we've been a-shutting up our windows, and thinking we were shutting the pizen out, instead of which we were a-shutting of it in." I soon got my window made to open at the top, and it has never been quite shut since; for we always sleeps six in this room. The neighbours did say, at first, that we should catch our deaths; but they soon saw that we were so much better, that half the people in the street open their windows at the top now.' The meeting is often closed by a short address from the City Missionary.

It will easily be seen that tact and skill, as well as kindness and a wish to do good, are needful qualifications for any lady who may attempt to teach those who have little wish to learn, and who feel their own independence. There must be a certain quiet dignity of manner, the self-possession that bespeaks respect, and that does not fail in moments of trial. Yes,

and there must be something else too. We think that some people are disqualified for work among the lower classes by an almost total want of imagination. They see dirt, and rags, and need of alms; they see nothing more. They find themselves in contact with beings wholly dissimilar in external circumstances from those with whom they are in daily converse; and they do not for a moment change places in thought with the people they visit, nor try to treat them as they would like to be treated were so strange a metamorphosis possible. They are kind in heart; they intend to do the right thing; but they fail for want of that delicacy of feeling that depends on imagination. We knew a lady placed in a position of much influence, with the power of bestowing handsome gifts among her poor neighbours. She was unremitting in her calls and her charities; yet, while her gifts were eagerly sought, her visits were never welcome. They would have been quite satisfied had she sent her money by her servant's hand. We often wondered why no one spoke well of her. At last, a poor woman, of plainer speech than her neighbours, gave us the clue we wanted. 'Do you know, the last time she called, she actually took off my saucepan with her own hand, that she might know what I was going to have for my dinner! I don't call her a lady!' Could any one in the habit of using aright her imaginative faculty have made such a practical blunder?

A case in point we cull from Mrs. Bayly's own pages.

'One of our poor mothers had for some months brought with her a very fine baby. He was a beautiful child, and so sweet-tempered that she had no difficulty in keeping him quiet. She was very proud of him, of course, and used to seat him on the table, and resort to a variety of little manoeuvres to induce us to notice and praise him. But when he began to cut his teeth, a sad change occurred. He became pale and thin, and so did the poor mother, through her night-watching and hard work; and we could barely recognise in them the bright child and happy mother we used to see. At last, the fair little head became covered with sores, very sorrowful to witness; instead of showing off her child, the poor mother concealed him as much as possible with her shawl, and sat apart from the rest of the company.

'One evening, a visitor came in and stayed about an hour with us. She evidently had not been much accustomed to such society, and did not feel at home in it. Whilst I was taking the money for the week, she tried to talk to some of the women, but I saw that she found great difficulty in it. Presently a feeble cry attracted her attention to the poor baby; with a look of great disgust, she said to the mother: "Why, what have you been doing with that child's head?" The mother looked very angry, and replied, "I haven't been doing of nothing with it. I suppose rich people's babies get bad heads some-

times, as well as poor people's." Many in the room sympathized with her, as I plainly saw, when looking up from my account-book. It seemed as if an evil spirit had suddenly alighted among us, for every countenance looked more or less angry... I rose from my seat, to fetch something that I did *not* want; and as I passed the offending head, I stroked the little pale face, and said, "Poor baby! how sad it is that it must begin to suffer so soon, and give its poor mother so many anxious nights and weary days!" The baby smiled upon me its accustomed smile; and by the time I was back to my seat, I saw the mother's head bent over the child; the quiet tears were dropping upon its face, and the evil spirit was gone.'—Page 153.

By such proofs of considerate sympathy did Mrs. Bayly win the love of her poor neighbours, till the roughest became gentle, and the most refractory docile; till an improvement was observable in the homes of all, while in some, Scripture principles were permitted to reign, and the family rejoiced together in the bond of Christian love. As one result of their changed feelings, may be named the earnest wish of some of these poor women to be employed as ministers of good to their sick and destitute acquaintances. Mrs. Bayly's 'mothers' had been encouraged to do little acts of kindness to one another at their weekly meetings. The elder women would help the younger by holding their babies, that they might get on all the faster with their work; those with good eyes bethought them of threading the needles for such as complained of failing sight; the healthy left the warm seats near the fire for the sick; and the two footstools were handed to the invalids. Small as this last trait may appear, it is not insignificant; for at first these stools were much sought after, and, 'I got it fust, and I shall keep it,' was often heard. By and by, three or four of these women offered themselves as missionaries to their neighbours, and they were regularly appointed to visit the sick and aid the ignorant. The pages that record the doings of these worthy women are as interesting as any in Mrs. Bayly's book. We can but give a single instance of willing and effective service.

'One of them spends the greater part of Monday morning in collecting money for the Savings' Bank. She has occasionally brought me as much as £2. in the evening, all obtained in small sums, even as low as a penny, and rarely higher than 2s. 6d. This poor woman suffered much from a swollen foot and leg. I have said to her, "I am afraid you must find it painful to walk and stand about so long." "Well, ma'am, 't is rather," she will say; "but it does me good: and I think how happy I shall be when I take it back to them in the winter, and they tell me it is all as if I had given it to them, for they haven't a-missed it."—Page 180.

It has often been remarked that no kindness shown by persons of superior station is so welcome to the needy sufferer as that offered by his kind and appreciating equal. The poor man's gift to his poorer friend is just the thing valued. It may be less costly; it is often far more suitable; and then it is all the sweeter because it is felt to come from self-denying love. The overflowsings of the rich man's cup are not so prized as part of a friend's own hard-won meal freely given. Then, however imaginative and however practical a lady may be, it is not possible that she should become so fully acquainted with the shifts to which need resorts, with the temptations, the feelings, the pleas, and the habits of the poor, as if she were one of themselves. Mrs. Bayly says truly that in dealing with one another there is 'no hope of getting on the blind side,' as with a lady: facts are known, and cannot be hid. It seems strange that, till lately, these admitted truths have been so little acted upon. Within the last few years, a thought suggested by the mind of one Christian worker has been gladly entertained by many others, and a native female agency, active and honoured, is spreading its network through the lowest depths of London life, and enclosing hundreds upon hundreds who have hitherto moved along out of reach of the ordinary fishers of men. The Bible-women, whose story L. N. R. tells so well in *The Missing Link*, promise to do a great work of regeneration among those to whom even the City Missionary has hitherto found access difficult. Already in many homes cleanliness and comfort have taken the place of indescribable wretchedness; and, better still, many a heart has listened to God's message, and been made new. The aid given to this reformatory scheme is something wonderful even in our age of abounding charity; and month after month, more friends send in their contributions, and more agents are sought after. We augur great results from the work thus commenced and proceeding; but we agree with a writer in *Good Words*, who says, 'After we have read the book, the conviction recurs that, while the plan is good, and it is surprising it has not been tried before, it will still be dependent for its efficiency on having the right sort of people to work it—*episcopai* like L. N. R. and agents like Marian.' Doubtless its chief promoters are aware of the peculiar difficulty of finding among the many Bridgets, and Esthers, and Agathas, who may offer their services, just the right kind of women; and they are prepared for disappointments and vexatious hindrances. The training and employment of the Bible-woman is in the hands of her lady-superintendent. This opens a path of usefulness for ladies who may wish to find an outlet for their cultivated energies, and

employment for their leisure hours; a path in which they may walk without misgiving, happy in the confidence that they are doing woman's appropriate work.

Somewhat doubtfully we take up Mrs. Wightman's *Haste to the Rescue*; and while reading the story of her efforts and successes among the labouring men of Shrewsbury, our fear that we cannot give it our unqualified approval gathers strength till it becomes certainty. This lady avowedly takes for her model the author of *English Hearts and English Hands*; only her aim is not so much a general reformation of character as the cure of one particular vice—drunkenness. We do not doubt that both ladies have been very useful to the classes for whom they have worked. We not only exonerate from blame, but we honour those whom a sense of duty has led into a course of erratic usefulness; but we are not sure that they do well in publishing their story, and in seeking to persuade other ladies to imitate their example. We are disposed to deprecate the multiplication of such books as they have written. In undertaking a mission to men, these ladies appear to us to have diverged from the true type of womanhood; and however much we may admire the new, we still think that 'the old is better.' We have no wish to see such exceptional cases set up as patterns for our countrywomen.

Nor is it only on this ground that we withhold our admiration from these much read and much praised books. Is it quite proper to receive confidence, and then to tell the world what trust has been reposed in us? And after such disclosures, can we expect our renewed attempts at friendship to be received with the same simple trust? We have heard it said that working men are not likely to recognise themselves in print; that they are small readers, and may never hear of the ladies' books. Such apologists can know little of the spread of literary gossip even in the lowest circles, and little of human nature. What man has not enough of mingled self-love and curiosity to wish to know what is written and read of himself? Others, again, plead that a cultivated mind is apt to mistake the feelings with which the lower classes would regard publicity given to their changes of opinion and practice. We are inclined to think that there was more of covert rebuke than of outspoken vanity in the request made by a working man to the kind and active wife of a country clergyman: 'Please, Ma'am, when you write a book about us, print our full names and not our initials, that we may have the glory of it.'

If working men have such delicate and such honourable feelings as these writers say, why wound them by treatment less honourable and less delicate? If they lack sensitiveness and

refinement, why not attempt to supply what is wanting, by superior teaching and example? In either case, we cannot think that a lady should act towards them as no gentleman would act towards his friend, and publish confidential letters without consent asked and given. In this view we are glad to find that the author of *The Ways of the Line* coincides. She says, in the Introduction of her work, 'This is a secular narrative. It is enough to say that the dull ear of many a strayed sheep was quickened to recognise the still voice of the Good Shepherd, and that wandering footsteps were turned into the narrow path that alone leads to the fold of peace and rest. Some vows were publicly taken to "fight manfully under Christ's banner"—doubtless they were registered elsewhere—and also, ere now, whether they have been kept or broken; but their utterances of religious feeling were always made in confidence, of which time certainly does not sanction the violation. The same reason obtains as to the publication of any of this correspondence. I should be seriously annoyed if any of them thought fit to publish my letters; and the accidental difference of station can afford no justification of a breach of good faith.' This lady's account of the navvies whom she visited during three years, should be read by those whose only acquaintance with the class is obtained through the pages of Miss Marsh's and Mrs. Wightman's books. If less *couleur de rose*, it bears the stamp of truth, as truth impresses itself on a plain and practical mind; and its details of work done well, and well rewarded, are interesting, as having preceded by some years the more recent and popular movement.

ART. VI.—*Mind and Brain: or, The Correlations of Consciousness and Organization.* By THOMAS LAYCOCK, M.D., F.R.S.E., Professor of the Practice of Medicine in the University of Edinburgh. Two Vols. Edinburgh: Sutherland and Knox.

AMONG the causes of human error, and the sources of controversy, there is none more deeply rooted or more wide in its operation than that which is now familiarly designated by the expressive German word, ONE-SIDEDNESS (*Einseitigkeit*). Our adverse systems of theology, our violent parties in Church and State, our great philosophical, ecclesiastical, and political revolutions, are all the product of moral and intellectual forces acting, under circumstances more or less favourable, in a one-sided

direction. Action, indeed, always is and must be in one direction; only speculation can look all round with an equal glance, precisely because from a central point once attained, so long as it remains mere speculation, it is not forced to depart. Hence, also, all action, while it intensifies the energy, necessarily narrows the sympathy; and by narrowing the sympathy becomes the occasion of imperfect views, that is, of error, in so far as truth is not recognised beyond the line of the actually existing and all-engrossing energy. One-sidedness, therefore, seems necessarily a condition of all finite activity. We can propose to ourselves only one end at a time; and while pursuing this end eagerly, we are apt to imagine that it is the only end in the universe worth pursuing, and that all other ends which we find sought after by other beings are either delusions or absurdities. From the narrow-mindedness thus engendered there is only one method of escape, and that is by the habit of philosophizing; a habit which, for practical purposes, may be conveniently defined as a habit of looking at all things from all sides, and thus approaching in thought, since we cannot in act, nearer to the central position of the Divine Mind, in whom alone all truth dwells, all divinations converge, and all contraries are seen to be only the opposite sides of a more rich and varied unity.

Of the one-sided tendencies of the present age, there is none more notable than the exclusive attention given by a certain class of thinkers to the merely material and external elements of the world, as opposed to what is internal, viz., mind; the human mind in the first place, and the Divine Mind, as the great original source both of all inferior minds and of what we call 'matter.' This one-sided tendency may be traced to Lord Bacon, and to the building up of physical science by induction, of which he propounded the scheme. The author of the *Novum Organum* unquestionably was a great philosopher; and yet his philosophy, as not being mere speculation, but a distinct declaration of war against hitherto existing methods, was necessarily one-sided. To say that instead of building beautiful theories of the system of nature, as Plato does in the *Timæus*, we should set ourselves in the first place to a careful collection of the small facts of nature, with the hope ultimately of attaining to some mastery of its great laws, was a wise advice, and has proved itself fertile in crop after crop of the most important practical results. Our steam-engines, our railways, our galvanic batteries, our electric telegraphs, our measurements of the moon, our sub-marine couriers—all the material and mechanical boast of the age has flowed, and continues to flow, and will flow yet more

miraculously, from this one plain practical common-sense advice. But there are other things in the world than steam-engines and spinning-jennies; there is the mind which made them; and with regard to this, we cannot honestly say that the Baconian method has hitherto been fertile of any great results. Nay, rather we think it is quite plain that in the region of lofty and serenest speculation, your pioneers of induction have often showed a one-eyed fixation of glance upon mere external aspects of nature, from which all largeness of view in reference to comprehensive mental phenomena was excluded. Men like Mr. Buckle, for instance, come forward with propositions to manufacture peoples and nations out of mere meadows and mountains, rushing rivers, stagnant canals, rice, roast beef, and potatoes, and everything but SOUL. Soul was not an external fact to be fingered and measured and tabulated: therefore your men of induction would have nothing to do with it. With them all facts were significant, except the one central fact of which all facts are the issue, viz., MIND. In the same way Mr. Darwin, in his recent attempt to explain the origin of species, enlarges with great ingenuity and eloquence on the modifications produced in living structures by external circumstances, and on the process by which accidental varieties may be transmuted into permanently differentiated types. But in endeavouring to give to these external modifying influences the dignity of sole efficient causes, he shows an incapacity or an unwillingness to recognise the one great internal cause of all animal life,—the Divine Mind, which, though concealed from human view, and beyond the touch of human finger, acts in its own central sphere as a force which modifies on a pre-determined plan, far more constantly and potently than the greatest array of external facts which human arithmetic can calculate. So it must always be. Inductive science may beat about and about and about, and, with the help of microscopes and telescopes, will certainly find many things that will make many people stare; but it will never be able to put its finger on that which is before, and above, and beyond all induction, viz., the mind of the human investigator, with all its innate and ineradicable instincts, and the kindred mind of the Divine Creator, with its exhaustless riches of primordial types, each distinct in its individual completeness, but all the same in their general tendency and in their total effect.

Another manifestation of the same one-sided regard to the merely external and mechanical is the manner in which some persons talk of nature, and the laws of nature; as if these terms meant or could mean anything but the grand scheme of the

Divine operations, and the method of these operations manifested in comprehensible detail. When in common parlance we talk of a country being governed by laws, we may seem to talk of a power, but in fact we only talk of a method; a method of social action proceeding from the intelligence either of the people at large, in the case of what is called consuetudinary law, or of special representative spokesmen of the people, in the case of statutory law. In like manner the laws of nature are not the real causes of any natural phenomenon; but only the constant and unvaried method of operation adopted by the Supreme Intelligence for the manifestation of His perfections. Those who are ever talking of the laws of nature without any reference to the Lawgiver, do so either from being possessed by the monstrous crotchet of atheism, or from a notion that they do sufficient honour to the Creator by allowing Him to wind up the watch of the universe once for all at the beginning of the cycle of things, and then keeping Him apart at an inactive distance from His own creation, where the stage is left clear for the self-acting laws of nature and the self-inspired doctors who expound them. The mental state of the genuine atheist—a mere morbid idiosyncrasy of a peculiarly abnormal kind—is to be explained in three ways. Either it is a violent revulsion from certain forms of anthropomorphic theology, which represent the Supreme Being as acting according to the uncertain and incalculable method of human caprice; or it is the result of a sort of extravagant intellectual pride and self-sufficiency, which will tolerate the thought of no superior, and recoils haughtily from the reverent recognition of a *master*; or, lastly, it is the mere sympathetic assumption of a general anarchy in the universe, similar to the moral anarchy which may prevail in a character which has thrown away the control of the higher regulative faculties,—the God within,—and is flouncing about in a restless career, which, as it commenced in confusion, can only end in destruction. The other kind of godless philosophy of nature, which does not distinctly repudiate God, but only casts Him back into a corner, where He is never heard of but on certain public occasions, when a pious parade seems proper, is more distinctly the fruit of that one-sided induction which deals with mere facts of the external world, and looks with suspicion on all sorts of ‘innate ideas’ or ‘intuitions.’ A rage for collecting facts is a very useful thing, no doubt, and may profitably fill up the void of a life which otherwise might fling itself from sheer weariness into the Thames or the Seine. But it can never beget an idea. Now God is an idea, and, indeed, the Father of all ideas; never to be reached, of course, by a purely inductive

science, which occupies itself with fingering facts, and arranging them according to 'laws.' Hence your man of physical science, when not prepared to reject God altogether as the originating Cause of the universe, contents himself with giving Him a theoretical acknowledgment once for all, but leaving Him out of view *in all*, as something which he does not know how to manage. Hence, though, like David Hume, he can distinctly and honestly profess that he is no atheist, yet is there no fragrance of piety about his knowledge; God is not in all his thoughts, and will rarely be found in any of his books. The world, under the guidance of such a teacher of mere physical externalities, becomes like the enchanted palace in Ariosto, where every man finds a magnificent lodging, but no man finds a hospitable landlord.

Now all this lamentable and dreary science, without inspiration and without God, never could have arisen if men had started with a full faith in their own soul and its God-begotten instincts, instead of going peddling and pottering about to collect and register infinite facts, which cannot possibly have a meaning to an intellect which does not believe in something which is above and before all facts. Take the example of a steam-engine. Let us suppose a dog, or some inferior animal, suddenly endowed with reason, and beginning to observe the different parts of this wonderful machine. He cannot possibly arrive at any conception of what this gigantic combination of beams and wheels means, unless, in addition to the capacity of observing facts, that is to say, in this case, noting and registering the different parts of the engine, he brings with him, previous to all experience, the notion of a design to be achieved by a certain mechanical combination, and of a force capable of being so directed as to achieve it; that is to say, unless he brings with him the innate idea of a designing Mind, and a creative force. This will bring him at once to a James Watt, whom he cannot see, and a steam-boiler, which he does not see; and these two invisible things, not derived from observation, supply the only powers by the action of which the results of observation can be measured or explained. With the great machine of the world it is even so. We must bring the idea of God with us from the dynamical action of our own mind, before the multiform and complex works of God can marshal themselves into Cosmos before our eyes. But there is an important difference to be observed between the steam-engine and the world. In this human machine we suppose the rationalized brute to arrive at the knowledge of two causes,—a designing mind and a propulsive force. In the Divine machine of the world these two are one.

God is both the mind and the steam ; He is a plastic and intelligent steam. Hence the absurdity of placing Him away in an extreme corner of creation, as if His presence were not required everywhere for the preservation of His works. If He is omnipresent, He must be present as a universally acting intelligent force ; what we call powers of matter, vital forces, and the like, can only be the constant and regular manifestations of this force. The laws of nature are only the methods by which this intelligent force is exhibited ; and the so-called principles of physical science, laws of motion, and so forth, are truly and literally nothing but the living stereotypes of the thoughts of an ever-existing Being, with whom every thought is a creative deed, and every volition an infallible law.

Another characteristic form which the one-sided use of the inductive method of physical research takes, is the tendency observed in some minds to deny the doctrine of 'final causes,' or teleology, as the Greek phrase has it, that is, the doctrines of ends and purposes (*τέλη*) in creation. The agreeableness of this doctrine to the natural instincts of a healthy human mind is obvious, both from its general popularity, and specially from its early recognition by Socrates, Cicero, and other well-constituted minds of antiquity. Perhaps, however, this very obviousness and popularity of the doctrine was a sufficient reason, with a certain class of minds, for denying it, and establishing thereby a claim to a peculiar sort of wisdom in which no unscientific mind could participate. Lord Bacon certainly seems to have given the key-note to the deification of external accidents proclaimed by Lamarck and Darwin, when he said that the theory of final causes is 'a barren virgin.' Goethe also added his weighty testimony to the same doctrine, when, in his conversations with Eckermann, he declared that the question *Why?* or *For what purpose?* is not a scientific question. The question which science puts is, *How?* And no doubt these great thinkers were led to make this observation from observing how, on the one hand, final causes often lie on the surface, exciting to no deep research ; and, on the other hand, objects or purposes are often assumed as obvious, which are no final causes at all, but only accidental uses of things convenient for the shallow philosophaster, who imagines himself to be the centre of the universe, and his pleasure the ultimate object of all creation. Thus a man very fond of eel-pies may imagine that eels were created for the purpose of being made into pies, and only for that purpose ; a Southern-State man in America may imagine that men with black skins and thick lips and woolly hair, in Africa, were made for the purpose of being hewers of

wood, and drawers of water, to men with white skins in other parts of the world, and only for that purpose; and an old maid in a garret, with a jolly singing blackbird in a cage, may imagine that blackbirds were created for the purpose of being caged, and only for that purpose. A whole world of such shallow, superficial, imaginary ends and objects of God in creation, may easily be observed springing from the brain of half-thinkers, or of persons who never think at all, except to put their momentary whims and passions into some attitude of reasonableness, to satisfy the ideas of those who define man a reasonable being. Such pretty convenient conceits for making God's vast plan serve as a waiting-maid on every paltry human wish or appetite, are no doubt 'barren virgins' enough in respect of all scientific fruit; but they no more disprove the doctrine of final causes generally, than the existence of any kind of delusion disproves truth, or of any kind of nonsense confutes sense. A distinct plan or scheme of a great battle may undoubtedly be in the mind of the general, though many a brave and sturdy private, in the hour of combat, knows no more of it than if it were a mere accidental riot, on a Queen's birth-day night, occasioned by the fixing of a cracker to the coat-tails of some testy old gentleman, or the crinoline of some nervous young maid. Neither is it at all correct what Goethe says, that the only real scientific question is, *How?* and not *Why?* It is no doubt a much more easy thing to say that heat exists for the purpose of giving expansiveness and flexibility and general adaptability to hard and harsh bodies, than to tell us what heat is, and how it produces these effects, whether by the infusion of some subtle matter, as used to be supposed, or by the excitement of certain motions, as Count Rumford first taught, and is now generally believed. But that the object or purpose of any piece of machinery, for instance, goes deeply into the comprehension of its nature; that the proper answer to the question *How?* depends upon there being a question *Why?* or *For what purpose?* previously put, is manifest from many considerations. If in the higher works of man we can always discover a scheme or purpose, and a plan, more or less imperfectly realized,—often, indeed, reached only through large and lamentable bungling,—but still a plan, with some result; while in the works of God, from all contemplation of intelligible object or result, rigid science bids us turn hopelessly away; then, truly, the boasted triumphs of modern physics are a small matter after all; and a chapter in Thackeray's *Book of Snobs*, or a column in *Punch*,—being at least something human, and a caricature of rationality,—offers an infinitely more intellectual employment than the starry

measurements which exercised the lofty thoughts of a Galileo, a Kepler, and a Newton.

But the calculators of planetary motions, and the inspectors of organized tissues, are not the only one-sided gentlemen in these days. The metaphysicians also, and the theologians, in their peculiar region, have sometimes walked and talked despotically enough. No doubt they had a better right to play the despot; for they started with self-existent mind—an omnipotent postulate—out of which anything might legitimately be made; whereas mere material laws and unconscious forms could be made to produce an intelligible result only by a juggle of words, and a confusion of ideas perfectly juvenile. But, however proud their theoretical position, it certainly was not wise to ignore facts; facts that were in every man's eyes, and only concealed from vulgar notice by their exceeding obviousness. That mind could not work without matter, in the present system of things, was patent to any man. For, how else should lofty metaphysicians, and soaring poets, and transcendental devotees, have condescended to take their dinner daily—giving material fuel to a spiritual fire—like any cat, or dog, or creeping thing? Here was a mystery, indeed, not at all palatable to those hasty aspirants who were eager to work every where without tools, and to scale the heavens without a ladder based upon firm earth. Accordingly, they followed only a natural instinct in averting the eye as much as possible from this view of the conditions of our human existence; and when George Combe and other curious students of our bodily organization came forward to tell the world that a man could not think without a brain, nor write epic poems without a bump of ideality plainly visible and tangible on the surface of the skull, nor beget children without a well-developed cerebellum,—at such announcements some pious persons very seriously took alarm, as if their proper intellectual unity was about to resolve itself into a loose dance of medullary molecules, and all consciousness could be stirred into existence, like a pudding, by the mere churning of curious nervous matter in the brain. Heated by this apprehension, some of them went so far as to charge the honest old Bumpologist with atheism. But the author of *The Constitution of Man* was too much of a plain, practical, cool-headed Scotsman, to be either an atheist or a pantheist. Atheism, indeed, is a monstrosity which is produced, to any considerable extent, only in France, the fatherland of all wild and rebellious paradoxes; and Pantheism is a transcendental attempt to explain the mystic connexion of 'the one and the many,' to which the union of speculative boldness

and fervid fancy, so characteristic of Germany, seems peculiarly favourable. But the metaphysics of the 'cannie Scot' keeps itself cautiously within the common limits of human thought; and neither George Combe, nor David Hume, though disbelievers in Christianity, were atheists or pantheists, as their works sufficiently declare. Neither, indeed, is there the slightest cause for Atheism in the doctrine of cerebral protuberances, as exponents of mental faculties, any more than in the common fact, that nerve is the exponent of vital sensibility, muscle of vital force, and bones of permanent form. Once for all, in the Divine system of things, so far as we know it, body is every where the external expression of internal forces. Whatsoever internal force manifests itself in any way, does it through body; whatsoever body, getting beyond Chaos, manifests any regulated forms or tendencies, does it through mind. In Christian theology, this close connexion of body and mind is plainly recognised. Otherwise, why the resurrection? Why not only a new heaven in prospect, but a new earth? The doctrine of the Neo-Platonists, and the Montanists, that matter is from the devil, not from God, and that the only perfect form of existence is an existence without body, was never a doctrine of the Catholic Church. Our theologians, therefore, and our exponents of consciousness, were decidedly one-sided in looking with suspicion on the philosophy of organization, as set forth by the philologists and the craniologists of the day. Nothing does more harm to religion than when pious men insist on attributing to a spiritual agency effects which proceed manifestly from material causes. It is as absurd to probe the conscience for the source of dyspeptic qualms, as to explain remorse, after an act of murder, by a disordered stomach. When Martin Luther was shut up in the Thuringian hold of the Wartburg, working at his famous translation of the Bible, the confinement did not agree with his active temperament, and the result of his sedentary habits was the common one of intestinal torpor, morbid irritability, and sundry uncomfortable imaginations and feelings thence resulting. Honest Martin did not know this; so he thought the uncomfortable feelings he experienced in his holy work could proceed only from the evil One, eager to prevent the loss which would necessarily accrue to his kingdom from the general dispersion of the written word of truth. Under this conviction he kept constantly lashing and rashing about at blue-bottle flies, and other imaginary incarnations of the tempter; of which painful exercise the tangible evidences are shown to the curious traveller, even at the present hour. Matters of this kind are innocent enough to the reflecting mind; but to the superficial

they give occasion for irreverent and profane remarks; and they are not wise Christians who give offence to scientific observers in matters of this kind. We do not fling ink-bottles at blue-bottle imps in this nineteenth century; neither do we burn ugly old women for imaginary intercourse with hard, cold, stony devils; but we are not yet free from the theological one-sidedness of attributing material effects to spiritual causes; or thus exposing the sacred truths of religion to the laughter of the superficial thinker, and the sneer of the cool scientific observer. If our expounders of nature seem often without God in their theory of the world, our apostles of God are not seldom chargeable with a culpable disregard of the constitution of things, under which it is God's pleasure that we should exist. The day is come when these polemical attitudes of our physical and metaphysical champions should cease, at least in the case of all those who believe in a higher wisdom than mere professional acuteness and dexterity; and with regard to matter and mind, instead of indulging futile 'oppositions of science falsely so called,' our well-constituted man of the nineteenth century should adopt the sacred marriage-maxim of the New Testament, *What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.*

We have been led into the above train of thought from a careful perusal of the learned and philosophical work just published by Dr. Laycock. We cannot but hail it as a good omen for the University of Edinburgh, that one of the Professors of her famous medical school should have come forward as an intelligent mediator between the one-sidedness of a philosophy of nature without mind, and a philosophy of mind without organization. Scotland is well known to be a very religious country; and Edinburgh, we know, as the capital of such a country, is prominent both in the profession and in the practice of piety. It is a remarkable thing, however, that before the appearance of Sir William Hamilton, a shallow, sophistical philosophy was much paraded in that city, of which the most prominent feature was an ingenious attempt to explain some of the most remarkable even of mental phenomena without God. Of this spirit the most notable manifestation was the much-bespoken theory of taste propounded by Alison and Jeffrey, which reduced to a mere arbitrary play of individual associations those eternal instincts of the beautiful which the Creator planted in the soul of man, as correlative to the types of intellectual beauty, according to which He had constructed the universe. God forbid that we should insinuate that the clear and kindly intellect of the first Editor of the *Edinburgh Review*

could entertain even for a moment the frigid absurdity of Atheism! but it is not the less true that his famous theory of Beauty (reprinted in the last number of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*) proceeds upon a direct rejection of the Divine Being from one great province of His own world; and that a similar process of reasoning, if consistently applied, would drive all reason and divinity out of the moral world also, and make the Ten Commandments the result of a mere capricious play of natural fancy with regard to the character of actions in themselves altogether indifferent. How far the godless frivolity of the Edinburgh philosophy of taste had tainted its philosophy of nature,—if there was any such,—we have no means of knowing. We rather think, from the example of Dr. Abercrombie, Alison, and others whom we might name, that the medical mind of the Scottish metropolis has known practically how to believe in a soul, though there was no means of touching it with the finger on the table of the dissecting-room. So far well. But the Scottish religion, and the Scottish philosophy, have, it must be confessed, always shown an evil tendency to lie apart, and not infuse themselves with a vital formative energy into the general mental life of the north. People were often very devout and orthodox on Sundays, in the exhibitions of whose Monday activity no fragrance of all-pervading piety was to be found. It seemed as if Scotsmen had got possessed of the idea, that God ought to be recognised with awe and sacred terror in the Church and in the Catechism, but not with joy and admiring delight in the halls of intellectual gymnastics, and in the fields that blossom with Divine loveliness. Scottish science, it must be confessed, before the genial apparition of Hugh Miller, was anything but fervidly pious. Scottish philosophy was rather given to spend itself in an empty show of meaningless and logical thrust and parry, practised in a separate fencing-room, kept ingeniously apart from a jealous theology on the one hand, and an ungodded nature on the other; while the Scottish pulpit—with all its faults the best and most national thing in the country—along with a great evolution of moral heat, was continually sending forth clouds of smoke and dust, which could have no tendency to restore God to nature, veneration to scientific research, and a holy significance to metaphysical speculation. Under these circumstances, we repeat, the intelligent spectator cannot but hail it as a good omen, and one of the best for Scotland, that the holder of one of her most authoritative medical chairs should have come forward with a metaphysico-physical treatise, displaying at once great variety of learned research, great comprehensiveness of view, and a most admirable

spirit of catholic appreciation. A great many minds have a wonderful faculty of negation, except in the domain of their own particular notion or crotchet; and there they say YES with portentous iteration: but Dr. Laycock's eye has a large range for other people's good things as well as his own, and his passion for full attestation of an important truth calls into court a complete array of the most diverse witnesses on both sides of the question, out of whose conflicting evidence, like a wise judge, and not a mere special pleader, he brings out, with large completeness, the harmonious and consistent truth. It is not every day we meet with broad and free intellects that know how to make Plato and Bacon shake hands, Cudworth and Combe kiss each other, while 'innate ideas' (which Locke is thought to have exploded) walk peaceably the highway, with Christian Theology on the right hand, and Histology on the left. But this large and liberal faculty of appreciation Dr. Laycock possesses in a very high degree: and it is this which to our mind gives the great charm to his book. He entertains his own views, but he is not therefore forced absolutely to deny the views of any other party; because he has planted himself in the central point from which all apparently contradictory views diverge; and that central point is God. From this point only, as from the top of a high mountain, all the winding glens of scientific research become harmoniously intelligible, and the panorama of human knowledge is complete.

Dr. Laycock has prefixed to his work a *Dissertation on Method*, very luminous and complete, which might stand as an admirable book of itself in a treatise of general logic, being, in fact, a forcible and able protest against all those partial and one-sided methods of a narrow science, which, as above stated, necessarily engender error. In this portion of his work, while allowing full weight to external physical influences, such as those expatiated on by Mr. Buckle, the Professor asserts no less strongly the agency of internal moral and intellectual forces in forming national character, and determining national destiny. Take the following extract, which, besides its important general truth, contains a special application to ourselves in that critical stage of civilization which we have now reached.

'Man does not live by bread alone. The alternate cycle of nutrition may be maintained by industrial effort, as in China at this moment, where the people, it is said, have already practically solved the problem; or the mountain-streams may bring with them to the plains all those elements of food for plants which man takes away, and, overflowing the land, deposit thereon their mineral wealth in the fittest condition for vegetable nutrition, as occurs in Egypt and

Mesopotamia, Hindustan, or Italy. Yet even under these circumstances, national decay occurs. The Assyrian and the Egyptian empires have long since disappeared, while the fertile plains of Hindustan and Lombardy have for centuries been the battle-field of more vigorous races. Here the exhaustion of the soil is no cause of national decay; for it has an inexhaustible supply of nutrient wealth in the overflowing rivers. We must look, therefore, to another cause of change, and this appears to consist in the decay of religion and morals. The natural development of the human mind is towards a knowledge of final causes. God and immortality are these final causes; but the relations of man to God and a future life constitute the foundation of religion and morals. It follows, therefore, that a practical mental science should investigate the laws of development of this knowledge in the individual and in the nation; and, applying the science of those laws to education, and to religious and moral culture, systematically evolve all the higher and nobler faculties of the human mind. To attain to such an end, physical and philosophical education must be combined with religious training, so that a knowledge of the laws of bodily vigour as well as of mental energy may be equally and consentaneously applied to the purpose. In all ages and in all nations, emascuate pursuits have been coincident with decay in religion and morals; for the form of worship has always reflected the mental characteristics of the age. Thus the general worship of a feminine deity, under whatever name, is significant of national effeminacy and degeneracy; while, on the contrary, the worship of one God in the spirit indicates the operation of those masculine faculties by which men attain to a knowledge of abstract truth, and are enabled to know and reverence the Divine.

Now, effeminate pursuits, in the mass as in the individual, are the natural sequence to impaired corporeal vigour and defective cerebral development. This is more particularly true of those emasculating vices which consist essentially in the gratification of the sexual lusts by unnatural means. Such vices act directly on the nervous system, and render it imperfect; while it is strengthened by the sports of the field, or by exercises which call forth the muscular powers, and the native love of enterprise and danger inherent in man. But there is a cycle of change in the moral world, as in the vital or physical world. Large cities are unfavourable to the development of corporeal vigour, unless hygiene, or the science of public health, bring all its appliances to bear on their domestic economy. And being this, they are favourable, conversely, to the development of a quick sensibility of the brain without a corresponding corporeal vigour; of a quick sense of pleasure and pain, with a corresponding readiness to seek after pleasure merely, or shun pain; and of all the vices which depend upon the desires.

The entire mental character, indeed, is connected with the action of those multitudinous causes of enervation which a high material civilization necessarily draws with it, if not scientifically counteracted. As the physical vigour decays, the instincts of astuteness and cunning

are developed in its place, and therewith fraud and falsehood in the various relations of life. In these respects the man becomes literally effeminate. The imagination also predominates over the reason, concurrently with exaltation of the cerebral functions, so that credulity and superstition are often correlative with a high æsthetic development, and with great quickness of perception and refinement of taste. The development of the fine arts is too often thought to indicate a corresponding advance in society; but it is evident from these considerations, that unless accompanied by an equal development of the manly virtues and of the intellectual powers, it is but a sign of national degeneracy. Hence, it too often happens, that the decay of a State dates exactly from the period when the arts of life attained their maximum.

On the other side, the author has stated with great clearness the inadequate views on certain important departments of the science of mind, that have proceeded from the one-sided study of the mere phenomena of consciousness.

‘It might be reasonably expected, that the various morbid mental states known as insanity, which so imperatively attract the attention of the physician, would have also led the metaphysician to a right estimate of that knowledge which experience gives as to the fundamental relations of body and mind; or that, at least, while he attempted to explain the laws of thought as manifested in healthy states of mind, a solution of the problem as to unhealthy states would have been attempted also. But philosophy does nothing of the kind. These morbid mental states are even rejected as sources of knowledge. Reid only represents the notion of a school when, in reference to the delusions of lunatics, he remarks, “All I have to say to this is, that our minds, in our present state, are like our bodies, liable to strange disorders; and as we do not judge of the natural constitution of the body from disorders or diseases to which it is subject from accidents, (a false premise,) so neither ought we to judge of the natural powers of the mind from its disorders, but from its sound state.” Hence, philosophy, in rejecting so valuable a source of knowledge, sheds no light upon one of the most terrible inflictions to which the mind of man is exposed,—gives no knowledge as to its relations to morals, no information as to its causes, no help as to its cure. The social evils that have resulted from this rejection of the teachings of experience are incalculably great, and pervade the whole business of human life. In particular, education, ethical philosophy, and the administration of justice manifest them. Thus, the judge and juries of the land cannot pass by the question in this easy fashion when they have to decide what is or is not insanity. To a conclusion they must come, whether or no, in the case before them; and as they appeal to philosophy, the law, as administered by them, is involved in the errors and ignorance of philosophy. This practical evil has been so strongly felt that, in 1843, the House of Lords called upon the judges of

England to declare authoritatively, in their collective capacity, what state of mind really constituted insane irresponsibility. The most important of their *dicta* was, that if it were proved that a criminal was incapable of distinguishing right from wrong when he committed the crime, the plea of insanity might be admitted, but not otherwise. The scientific and practical value of this solemn judicial *dictum* may be estimated from a consideration of the fact that a large majority of acknowledged lunatics, now legally restrained in public and private institutions for the insane, do possess this knowledge; and that, in truth, the government of these institutions is conducted almost wholly upon the principle that those who have to be governed have knowledge of good and evil, and of right and wrong. It follows, therefore, that if the judicial *dictum* were strictly applied, these persons ought not to be restrained, but should, as responsible agents, be permitted to enjoy social liberty.

On the important point of the personality of the Supreme Being—a stumbling-block to some would-be profound intellects—Dr. Laycock has propounded his views with great distinctness. He illustrates and strengthens his argument by citing the opinions of an eminent Scottish theologian, and a distinguished French naturalist. But they are so excellent in themselves, and express so admirably the tone of thought characteristic of these volumes, that it is with great reluctance we forbear to quote the passage which includes them.

The title of Dr. Laycock's work, *The Correlations of Consciousness and Organization*, at once suggests the comprehensive plan according to which it is laid out. He has always a double task before him: to give a philosophy to nature from the only possible position, of intellectual force (thought in action—God); and to give working materials and tools to mind from the only element of which we have any experience, viz., matter. In following out this latter half of his work, he is necessarily brought into the same field, the breaking up of which offered a life-long pleasant employment to the late George Combe. That Combe belonged to the class of men who can only come to a close grapple with truth under the possession of one idea, is pretty plain; that he vastly overrated the practical importance of cranioscopy, even if its scientific truth were proved, is equally evident; but that the doctrine of a detailed and differential expression of mental power in the mass and form of the brain, is not absurd or contrary to the presumptions afforded by a large philosophy, no thinking man will assert. If the brain be, as all allow, the grand central organ both of sensibility and consciousness, nothing can be more natural than that the several parts of it should have separate functions. The cerebellum, for instance, is a very marked subdivision of the great cerebral substance;

and precisely in reference to this part do we find that phrenologists and general anatomists have accumulated the greatest number of striking facts, seeming to indicate that it performs special functions with regard to the organs of reproduction. On this subject a very curious work was published by Combe;* and the vivisections made by Dr. Julius Budge, of which some account is given in the *British and Foreign Medical Review* for April, 1844, are directly confirmative of the external observations of the phrenologists. The general medical world, however, is yet far from admitting the validity of phrenology as a doctrine of specialized functions of the different parts of the brain; and the following summation of Dr. Laycock's views on this interesting subject must be regarded as only one side of a curious and difficult case, well put by a learned and intelligent advocate.

'The organology of the convolutions has been made a subject of research by numerous anatomists and physiologists. That a minute cranioscopy, founded on the European type, is applicable to all races of men, may be well doubted; but all agree in admitting the validity of the great regional divisions of phrenology. Thus the middle region of the encephalon, whatever it may be (possibly the middle lobe), which corresponds to the central region of the head, of which the crown or centre of the hair is the focus, seems to be the seat of the egotistic faculties. Superiorly are the organs of the egotistic sentiments, inferiorly of the egotistic instincts and propensities.

'Posteriorly to this region is that of the sexual and domestic instincts and sentiments, in relation, by arterial connexion with the cerebellum; anteriorly to it the relative instincts and sentiments termed moral, and which are founded on the intuitions of truth and perfection, good and evil. In close connexion with this group are the æsthetic faculties, founded on the intuitions of the beautiful: and, finally, in front are the organs of the faculties by which a knowledge of the order of phenomena, and of the modes of action of the physical forces, is attained. These are the faculties of observation, deduction, and induction, founded on the intuitions of the forces. The size of the convolutions will depend in all cases on the complexity and number of the intuitions, the extent of corporeal differentiation, and the correlative external relations of the organism.

'As the development of the convolutions is from before backwards, it is probable that there is a continual evolution and differentiation of the anterior lobes backwards, and that they co-ordinate, as a fundamental function, all the substrata of the other convolutions, or, in other words, they are the central and unifying organs of the mind. It is in those convolutions that the kinetic substrata of language, as

* *On the Functions of the Cerebellum.* By Drs. Gall, Fimont, and Broussais. Translated from the French by George Combe. Edinburgh. 1838.

expressive of the thoughts, are in the anterior lobes which rest on the *os frontis*. A man in disease of the brain is not able to speak his thoughts, but he can read aloud, or repeat what is spoken to him. And as with speech, so also with all those actions by which the human hand represents ideas in material form, whether in painting, music, sculpture, or the constructive arts generally. It is in accordance with all the laws of development, that there are both kinetic and regulative substrata in connexion with these faculties.

'The facial development appears to be in regional correspondence with the cranial development. The under lip and lower jaw are more especially developed concurrently with a preponderating evolution of the organic and war instincts; their development, therefore, indicates in man both corporeal vigour and force of character. The upper lip and upper jaw correspond generally to the region of the domestic and relative instincts and sentiments: the nose to the higher moral and æsthetical sentiments; and the eyebrows and forehead to the region of the knowing and intellectual faculties. Although these empirical conclusions are obviously very general, and not of easy application to the diagnosis of individual character, and although, when thus explicitly stated, doubts may be excited as to their validity, yet it is a matter of common experience that men do habitually use an instinctive physiognomical knowledge, of which these are the general principles.

'The infinite diversity of character, and the resulting variety in the play of the vital forces, modify the development of these fundamental forms of brain, cranium, and face, to an extent which has not yet been investigated, either ethnologically or specially, in a scientific spirit. A step of this kind, in the direction of human palæontology, has been made by M. l'Abbé Frère, Canon of the Cathedral of Paris, who has lately formed a collection of ancient skulls, sent to him from all parts of Europe; and deduced from a comparison of them the general conclusion, that, in proportion as the skull belongs to an ancient or primitive race, in the same proportion the frontal region is flattened, and the occipital developed. Such a conclusion, if verified, would go far to establish the general law, that each of the successive generations of men adds something, however small, to the evolution of the human mind; and that, amidst all the struggles of races, and the decay of inferior tribes, a higher and nobler type of humanity is more and more developed.'—Page 461.

The office of a just criticism unfortunately requires that the vices as well as the virtues of a book should be noted. We shall therefore conclude by calling Dr. Laycock's attention to three faults, which strike us on the face of his otherwise admirable work. In the first place, he is too much given to the parade of a learned terminology. This is a great fault in a work intended not only for professional students, but, as the author intimates in his Preface, for readers of general intelligence and culture. Scientific men are not sufficiently aware how great a barrier they raise between themselves and their readers by the

unnecessary prominence given to technical phraseology. There is no reason why Dr. Laycock's work—certain parts of it at least—should not be as well read as the famous *Vestiges of Creation*, or any other popular presentation of the great results of modern science. But in order to attain this end the learned Professor should have avoided a technical phraseology, as carefully as he seems to have sought it. There is nothing gained, in point of clearness of idea, by the introduction of such words as 'teleiotic' and 'kinetic;' and in point of popular effect a great deal is lost. General readers are apt to be not only lazy, but diffident: they are easily startled into a belief that a big word contains a profound mystery; and under this impression will fling away a useful and even entertaining work in despair. We have known an intelligent young lady refuse to look at a work written in a very popular style, because there was a Greek quotation fronting her at the bottom of the first page! In the next place, Dr. Laycock not only makes unnecessary parade of new-fangled Greek words; but he coins them by a method of his own, quite contrary to the known analogies both of the classical Greek and of the Anglicized Hellenism. Such a word as '*organismic*,' for instance, is contrary to all propriety. There is no such adjective ever formed from verbal substantives in *ισμα* or *ισμός*, as the example of *sylogistic*, *deistic*, and others, sufficiently shows. The Latin termination *al* may indeed be added to a Greek word in *μός*, as in *baptismal*; but having these two legitimate forms, Dr. Laycock had no right to invent a third one, for which there is not a shadow of authority in Greek, Latin, or English works. Equally false is the new word '*pathemic*,' (from *πάθημα*,) which, according to the analogy of *μάθημα*, should have been *pathematic*. In the third place, Dr. Laycock, in his eager desire to enlist all sorts of agents in the service of truth, sometimes forgets the judicious rule of legal practice that *a weak witness often does more harm than no witness at all*. Now, of all the witnesses that can be called in to help a scientific case, the most difficult to deal with is conjectural *etymology*. We do not mean, of course, scientific etymology historically guaranteed, but such etymology as is found in Plato's *Cratylus*, in Cicero's work *De Naturâ Deorum*, in Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon, and other familiar places. We mean the etymology which tells us gravely, as Dr. Laycock does, that the first syllables of the Latin word *elementum*, and the Greek *Ἑλμος*, and the Hebrew *Eli*, are the same. Equally wrong is the learned Professor in insisting dogmatically that the Greek substantive verb *ἔσμεν*, in Acts xvii. 28, means 'we have our *conscious* existence,' and not simply *we are*. There is no warrant for any such interpolated significance in the best Greek writers.

And now we have done. The faults which are here mentioned are small; and we have no wish to dwell upon them. It is only in a beautiful piece of sculpture like Dannecker's Ariadne in Frankfurt, that one is reluctantly forced also to notice the blue spots in the marble; and the substantial merits, both in the conception and execution of Dr. Laycock's work, are such as amply to compensate a few minor defects in the accessories.

ART. VII.—*The Life of the Right Rev. Daniel Wilson, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Calcutta, and Metropolitan of India. With Extracts from his Journals and Correspondence.* By the REV. JOSIAH BATEMAN, M.A., Rector of North Cray, Kent, his Son-in-Law and first Chaplain. Two Volumes. 8vo. London: Murray. 1860.

RELIGIOUS biography is sometimes objected to on account of its sameness. 'When we have read one Life, we have read them all; for they are all alike.' Perhaps to some extent this is true; for where many persons are dealing with a common subject, something relating to it will be found in the biography of each; and inasmuch as true religion can be but one in all times and places, there is less scope for variety in regard to it than in regard to art or science. Yet there is no necessity that the general resemblance which must obtain should interfere with the exhibition of personal characteristics; and the fact that Christians are to be found in all ranks, persuasions, and professions, should insure for religious biography a wider range of subjects, and a greater diversity of interest, than belongs to any other description. And in reality it does so. The objection to which we have referred is destitute of any solid foundation; and perhaps has its rise somewhat deeper than in the literary taste of the objector, who reads the kindred Lives of Haydon and Wilkie without complaining, and is quite ready to begin with William Napier, though it is not long since he laid down the hero of Scinde. But neither painting nor soldiership awakens the class of interests and emotions to which religious biography generally appeals.

The Lives of Bishops do not usually teem with incident; yet they are, as a class, remarkably interesting, presenting a great variety of character, and containing treasures of anecdote. We have often wished to see this class of books made the subject of an occasional review. It is a mine that would pay for working. The academic, the scholar, the theologian, the antiquarian, the

courtier, the politician, the missionary, the rector, are all here, either separately or in combination; and sometimes a little of each in the same person will gratify and reward the student of human nature. Our present subject was neither courtier, politician, nor antiquarian; but he was what these gentlemen sometimes are not, and what in a Bishop is more commendable than many other acquisitions,—a diligent and powerful preacher; and his Life, whether in the university, the parish, or the diocese, is pre-eminent, even in the class to which it belongs, for interest and variety. None can decline to take it up on the ground that they have read so many like it before; and we are much mistaken if any who begin will find it ‘impossible to finish.’ Our difficulty has been to lay it down.

One charm of the book is, that it is, to a great extent, an autobiography. In early life Daniel Wilson kept a journal, which, after a pause of more than twenty years, he resumed and carried on to his last hour, writing in it till, in his own phrase, he was ‘dead almost.’ His correspondence was extensive and constant. He left England before the penny postage was originated, and his letters therefore always cost something; and as his friends happily did not belong to that class who burn all letters as soon as they are answered, they have preserved them with care. This mass of material, accumulated through a long life, is an unspeakable advantage to a biographer if he has but patience to deal with it; and patience in such a case is very much a question of time. Mr. Bateman had the leisure, and did not grudge the labour. He has sifted the mass diligently. Some idea of its dimensions may be formed from one ‘little item’ for which he acknowledges his obligations to Archdeacon Pratt,—‘two thousand five hundred folio pages extracted from the archives of the diocese of Calcutta.’ The two years which the book has occupied him, must have been years of severe labour. But it was well bestowed, and has been well rewarded. ‘Easy writing is hard reading,’ says the proverb; but here the converse is exemplified. The biographer labours, the reader enters into his labours. Selection, arrangement, correction, where needful; connecting remarks, whether cautionary, explanatory, or historical; these are the tasks which Mr. Bateman had to undertake if Daniel Wilson was to be his own biographer; and well has he discharged them. A measure of self-denial is implied in all this which the reader will appreciate. He who could prepare the material with so much dexterity, could have written well himself; but throughout the volumes the subject is prominent, and the author is concealed behind it. There is nothing to distract or divide attention. From first to last you see and hear Daniel Wilson, and no one else.

Bishop Wilson's son and successor in the vicarage of Islington inherited his copyrights and manuscripts; but in his case 'the tie of relationship was deemed too close to admit of that freedom of speech and impartial exhibition of character, without which the records of a life are valueless.' It was under these circumstances that Mr. Bateman was selected; and though between a gentleman who was both sister's son and son-in-law to the Bishop, and his own son, there was the least possible difference of relationship, yet this is a point with which the public have no concern, and the 'familiarity with Indian life and customs' which the son-in-law had acquired, while the son had necessarily remained at home, might well, other things being equal, determine the question. The influence of kindred or affinity, however, is scarcely perceptible. Mr. Bateman holds an even balance, and, while he makes no attempt at concealing what every body knew, or at palliating what he does not excuse, does not overstate faults, that he may gain the credit of impartiality with indiscriminating judges. Perhaps he scarcely does justice to all his relative's virtues; but this is an error on the safe side; and it might be wished that others would imitate him herein. Religion would be a gainer in all respects if the pictures of some of her votaries were less highly coloured, or their statues the size of life rather than of colossal proportions. When we have added that two portraits and twice ten woodcuts adorn these volumes, and that a map of India enables us to follow the route of every visitation tour, we may pass from the book to its subject without fear of doing injustice to the author, who has our hearty thanks for so valuable an addition to the literature of the Church.

Daniel Wilson deserved a good biography, for he was a man of mark. His name has been prominently before the public as a leader of the Evangelical party in the Church of England for more than half a century; and it would have been a subject of just regret if the memorial reared to his honour had been, like some 'Lives' that might be specified, a monument of the feebleness, indiscretion, or bad temper of his biographer. As it is, he will take his place among the 'worthies of England' without being challenged by posterity. It will be seen that the high estimation in which he was held, rested not on merely technical or conventional grounds, but on solid worth, and great force of character. He was not distinguished by versatility of genius, nor did he aim at multifarious acquirements. But what he undertook he succeeded in; and it is better to do even one thing well than three or thirteen indifferently. To be a good preacher, a good pastor, a good missionary, is the work of a life; and he

that accomplishes it, having bestowed his life well, need not hanker after distinction derived from other sources.

Born in Church Street, Spitalfields, in 1778, and educated at Hackney by the Rev. John Eyre, the minister of Ram's [Episcopal] chapel, Homerton, one of the fathers and founders of the London Missionary Society, Daniel Wilson was, at the customary age of fourteen, bound apprentice to his uncle William, a wealthy silk manufacturer and merchant in Milk Street, Cheapside. Here he continued in all about five years and a half; the next thirteen years were spent mostly at Oxford; for thirteen more he filled the pulpit of St. John's, Bedford Row; eight were spent at Islington, and nearly twenty-five in the work of the Indian episcopate.

Had he continued with his uncle, he would probably have risen to commercial eminence. The family were then, as they still are, highly respectable and wealthy; and, in due time, the mayoralty, and possibly the representation of London, would have fallen into his hands. He turned his back on those things, and, in intention at least, forsook all, that he might preach the Gospel. If he was not suffered to lose all his worldly substance, and even if, according to the promise in its literal acceptation, he received 'manifold more in this present life,' the virtue of his early choice is not depreciated by the reward bestowed upon it.

How he came to choose the Gospel ministry as the business of his life, we are very plainly and instructively told. There was not then a family living which he must be prepared for, nor were his friends perplexed to know 'what else to do with him' when they sent him to the University; nor was he a youth so much in love with study as to be unfit for the activities of commerce. He appears to have done as well in the warehouse, or counting-house, as most lads of his age; but was fond of pleasure and addicted to self-indulgence. Religion he utterly neglected; and to excuse his neglect, he appears to have had recourse (very naturally) to the Calvinistic doctrines, which he was accustomed to hear from the pulpits of those churches where his uncle regularly attended, as Romaine, Scott, John Newton, or Cecil preached: 'If he were elected, he should be saved; if not, what was the use of seeking salvation?' To this question a young man in the warehouse replied in substance, that God had ordained both the end and the means; and our duty was to use the means. Wilson said, he had none of the feelings toward God which He required and approved. The young man, true to his doctrine, that means were to be used even by the elect, replied, 'Pray for the feelings then.' The arrow went home. When bed-time came, Wilson began to pray, and 'the feelings'

came. Nor did he cease to pray from that time forward, till, as he grew near to the close of his days, almost half his time was spent in prayer.

As the 'young man' referred to was still living when these volumes were published, his name is very properly concealed. By and by it may appear; if not, the Judge of all knows it, and will not fail to reward his fidelity. Meanwhile what an encouragement to private and individual effort does the history furnish! We have now to add the name of Daniel Wilson to the long list of eminently useful men who, under God, owe all to a word spoken in due season, not from the pulpit, but across the counter, or in some other form of the intercourse of private life. The 'single talent' is indeed 'well employed' when a man of Wilson's powers and influence is gained for Christ by the exercise of it.

Much as we admire the young man's fidelity to his convictions, we cannot praise his logic. It may be correct to say that since He who ordains the end ordains the means also, the elect are not excused from praying; but this does not touch the case of the non-elect, for whom no end is ordained, but wrath. No wonder that with the feeling of serious concern about his best interests, Wilson's perplexities revived; or that we find him repeating his question to Mr. Eyre in a letter, in which he discloses the state of his mind to his old schoolmaster: 'If God hath fore-ordained that I shall be brought to a knowledge of Himself, how can any thing I do or say prevent the designs of His omnipotent will?' And again, 'What I think I most want to know is, whether a conscientious reformation of my outward life is in the least accessory to my future safety.' That such questions should be asked by any one who had a Bible and could read it, clearly shows the ascendancy which the system had over his mind from the beginning. But for this he might have clearly seen the 'designs of an omnipotent will' frustrated, and learned that 'conscientious reformation' was indispensable to his 'safety;' and, we will add, might have sooner found relief from his sorrow, and proved through his long life a happier and more useful man.

Wilson's deep religious concern brought him into acquaintance with Mr. Newton of St. Mary Woolnoth, then a patriarch in the religious world, who opened his house two or three times every week for religious conversation and prayer. Some fragments of their conversation are preserved, and exemplify very clearly those low defective views on Christian experience which have been the source of so much weakness to the Evangelical party in the Church of England. The youthful penitent was encouraged to 'wait patiently the Lord's good time' for his

deliverance, as though the Lord Himself had not taught us that 'now is the day of salvation.' 'I don't like folks who jump all at once into comfort,' said the good old man. 'It is better to go on gradually. God lays the foundation in the heart; and the walls no sooner peep above ground, than we want the roof clapped on. But that won't do.' (Vol. i., p. 19.) This curious analogy, which makes comfort the crowning and final possession of the godly, was never learned from the New Testament; nor is it sanctioned by any of its teachings. We wonder what our clergyman would have said to the Pentecostal converts, who were awakened, pricked to the heart, and enabled 'gladly' to receive the word the same day; or whether he would have 'liked' the jailer at Philippi, who between midnight and daylight was enabled to 'rejoice believing in God.' Paul's conversion, too, does not seem to have occupied more than a week at most; yet the superstructure of his religion was as solid and enduring as though the foundation had been years in laying.

In time Daniel Wilson learned the great Gospel lesson of looking away from himself, and from the decrees also, 'unto Jesus,' and found peace in believing. Something more than a year and a half from that memorable evening when he began to 'pray for the feelings,' he made up his mind to seek the Lord at His table; and communicated for the first time at Mr. Eyre's chapel, October 1st, 1797. Next day he writes to his mother in language which shows that he did indeed 'draw near in faith,' and took that 'holy sacrament to his comfort,' and which leaves nothing to regret, but that he did not do so sooner.

'I have nothing but mercy to tell you of. O that my heart was but melted with love and gratitude to my dear Redeemer for such rich grace as He is continually showering upon my soul!

'To know that my Lord still does continue, and ever will continue, to love my worthless soul; that He still pardons all my unnumbered sins, and still shines upon me with the beams of His love: to know and feel such precious truths as these, is enough to break the very adamant into praise. Pray for me, my dear mother, that under the mercies with which the Lord is, as it were, overloading my soul, I may be kept very humble at His feet, sensible of my utter unworthiness and absolute dependence upon Him.'—Vol. i., p. 28.

To Mr. Vardy, a young friend, who was then preparing to go out as a missionary of the London Missionary Society, he writes as follows, two days afterwards:—

'Never did I enjoy so much the presence of my dear Redeemer as I have since that time; and this not so much in great sensations of pleasure as in brokenness of heart, and, I trust, in sincere desires to be devoted to His glory. *Yesterday and to-day have been, I think,*

the happiest days I ever remember. The Lord shines so upon my soul that I cannot but love Him, and desire no longer to live to myself but to Him. And to you I confess it, (though it ought perhaps to be a cause for shame,) that I have felt great desires to go or do any thing to spread the name of Jesus; and that I have even wished, if it were the Lord's will, to go as a missionary to heathen lands.—Vol. i., p. 29.

Thus 'moved,' as we do not doubt, 'by the Holy Ghost,' he had no rest in his spirit while he continued in business. Great were his searchings of heart lest he should 'miss his providential way,' and long and frequent his consultation with friends. Mr. Rowland Hill, Mr. Cecil, Mr. Goode, of White's Row, Spitalfields, (a dissenting minister, by the way, whom it seems not unlikely his parents heard frequently, if not regularly,) all encouraged him: at length his father consented to his leaving business, and in May, 1798, he was entered at St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford. In the November following he went to reside; having filled up the interval of five months with private study in the house* of the Rev. Josiah Pratt, then curate to Mr. Cecil at Bedford Row, afterwards the Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, and, finally, Vicar of St. Stephen's, Coleman Street. For this good man he cherished a sincere attachment, and seems never to have omitted an opportunity of testifying his obligations to him as long as he lived. For his Oxford Tutor, too, the Rev. Isaac Crouch, he entertained the deepest respect; and the acknowledgments he was wont to make to him, both in public and private, do honour to his heart.

At Oxford he studied hard, lived frugally, kept good company, and evidently grew in grace. No wonder he loved the University, and never took his name off the books. He passed his examinations with credit; took his degrees of B. A. in 1802, and M. A. in 1804; and in the year between gained the prize for the English Prose Essay on Common Sense, which he read in the theatre at the Commemoration held in June, 1803; being followed on the rostrum that day by one who preceded him in the bishopric of Calcutta, the lovely, accomplished, and lamented Reginald Heber. The biographer adds:—

'The one had delivered his essay on "Common Sense," when the other rose to recite his poem on "Palestine."

'There is something affecting in the picture of these two young aspirants, thus brought together in the morning of life, who were afterwards called "to bear the burthen and heat of the day" in the same far distant land: something also in the scrolls they held characteristic

* From a letter to his mother, dated Doughty Street, Russell Square, May the 10th, 1798, we gain a hint as to the growth of London in our times. 'I have,' he writes, 'a most beautiful prospect from my room over the fields, unobstructed by any houses.'

of the men; the one throwing over India the charm of poetry, piety, and a loving spirit; the other stamping upon it the impress of scriptural supremacy and evangelical truth: something of adaptation also in the Divine ordering of those consecrated spots where they "rest in their grave;" the chancel of St. JOHN'S, Trichinopoly, and the chancel of St. PAUL'S, Calcutta.'—Vol. i., p. 69.

'The day following these recitations one of the Heads of Houses met Mr. Crouch in the High Street, Oxford.

"Well, Mr. Crouch," he said, "so Common Sense has come to St. Edmund's Hall at last." "Yes," replied Mr. Crouch, with his quiet humour, "but not yet to the other colleges."—*Ibid.*, p. 70.

St. Edmund's Hall had not only got Common Sense, but knew its worth; so when Mr. Crouch found his health failing, he persuaded Daniel Wilson, who had been ordained in 1801, to leave Chobham, where he was acting as curate to Mr. Cecil, and come to help him in the tutorship. After three years he succeeded his friend as vice-principal, and held that office five years and a half. He married, in 1803, his 'most dear cousin,' Anne, eldest daughter of the uncle to whom he had been apprenticed, who now resided at Worton, sixteen miles from Oxford, having purchased an estate there. Of this small parish Daniel Wilson became curate, going over for his Sunday duty, and occupying himself with college work during the week.

Having now seen him fairly settled in life, and entering upon his course with good prospects, we may consider him as a preacher. His first sermon was preached at Chobham from John vi. 37: he tells his mother that he was enabled to deliver freely what he had prepared, and his reception was far beyond his expectations. Both here, and afterwards at Worton, he appears to have taken most commendable pains to avoid the error into which many young clergymen fall, of bringing the dialect of the University into the pulpit. We can make allowances for this. Four years' familiarity with classics and mathematics, with but little, if any, opportunity of extemporaneous speaking, is certainly not the best preparation for dealing with a congregation often composed, to a great extent, of farmers' labourers. But still the evil is a serious one; many sermons, for want of adaptation in style and phraseology, being mere 'heathen Greek' to the rustics who listen to them. Mr. Cecil saw this plainly, and gave his youthful helper sound and characteristic advice on the subject.

'I particularly wish you would study hard to prepare yourself for this place. It is not enough that a man has good intentions. He needs also capacity, knowledge, aptitude,—all which, you know, are greatly improved by study; and study itself much depends on method.

'Now then for the method. Go amongst the poorest and most

illiterate of the people where you dwell, and let your subject of discourse to them be the solar system. Endeavour with great plainness to defend Copernicus against Tycho; and make them thoroughly understand the difference and the superiority. Don't let one depart till he is fully convinced that the sun must be placed in the centre.

"Stop," say you, "I shall never be able to make them understand my very terms." No? Then invent new ones adapted to their capacity: for much easier is it to give people right notions of the solar system than of the Gospel; and far more willing will they be to let the SUN stand in his place there than here. Pray, therefore, study hard; and in a way a college never teaches.'—Vol. i., pp. 73, 74.

His own views as to the duties of a preacher, and the method of preaching, at this early period, are very judicious and evangelical. We extract the following paragraphs, translated from some private memoranda written in Latin before his ordination.

'Scripture should be often quoted. What a man says on his own authority is not sufficient. The words of God come with power and win assent, and have a savour of dignity and majesty.....Christ must be magnified in every sermon. To neglect Him is to neglect all. If a man were to preach Judaism, he would do no good. Why? Because he failed to raise before the eyes of all, CHRIST the brassen serpent. Every thing is cold, dull, and torpid without the sun.....Duties must be so explained that their connexion with Gospel truth may be evidently seen, while Gospel truth must be so laid down that duties may cling to it. When we have clear light, it is a shame to walk in darkness. To teach only what the better instructed among the Jews would have taught, avails nothing. We must go further, and not only dwell upon those things which the ancients knew whilst darkness was yet lingering on the earth, but exhibit prominently these illustrious Gospel truths which the Sun, now risen, has made manifest to all men.'—Vol. i., pp. 76, 77.

These views he held before he went to Oxford, as a letter to his friend Vardy, dated 1797, plainly shows. He had heard him preach, was dissatisfied with what he heard, and afterwards discharged one of the most difficult duties of true friendship, in pointing out the defects of his friend's discourse. Beginners in the ministry, of any Church, may study with advantage the words of this pious youth:—

'Pardon my ignorance and presumption, but I think your choice of a subject was not the most easy and simple, which is what you should aim at. I think if you were to take texts such as these:—

"The love of Christ constraineth us." "Christ is all in all." "Who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." "With Him is plenteous redemption:"—

'or any other where you would be unavoidably led to speak principally on the person and work of Christ; your heart would be more likely (humanly speaking) to be affected with your subject than on

other topics, which, though connected with, do not so immediately lead you to dwell on, the glories of Jesus.

'I should think that you might, with little difficulty, preach a good sermon on that one word, CHRIST. Begin with Christ, go on with Christ, and end with Christ; and I am sure your hearers will never be tired, for His name is like "ointment poured forth."

'On such a subject you need only look within to find matter enough to explain what Christ came to redeem you from; you need only go to Calvary to see what redemption cost, and to have your soul so moved by the sight of a bleeding Saviour, that you could no longer hesitate what to say; and you need only reflect on what you are, to explain the necessity of Christ's intercession at the right hand of God. Look more, my dear friend, to Jesus. There is nothing like looking *only*, looking *simply*, and looking *perseveringly* to Him.'—Vol. i., pp. 25, 26.

Six months afterwards we find a sketch of a sermon well adapted to a congregation such as he then had. Mr. Cecil, indeed, in one place, sneers at 'three heads and a conclusion;' and his sneer has done much to discourage the use of them. But the aid to memory which divisions and sub-divisions furnish is so great, that we should be glad to see a general return to the old practice, which has another recommendation in its influence on the preacher's mind in composition. Method tends to condensation, and we fear that more sermons are spoiled by diffuseness than by any other cause. The complaint against long preaching is heard almost every where; how seldom the opposite! The old-fashioned 'application,' too, in this little sketch, pleases us well. It tells of that earnest purpose and endeavour to be useful, without which usefulness is never likely to be achieved; and calls to mind a class of preachers whose applications were as carefully prepared as their discussions, and more effective than any other parts of the discourse.

He complains of himself that his manner was too vehement: 'It is all *vi et armis*. I make clamour, and shouting, and noise my helpers—as if sound without sense ever did any good;' but we doubt if his parishioners complained. Among such auditories as those of Bisley and Worton, sense without sound is almost as worthless as sound without sense; and it is an unspeakable advantage to a preacher to be heard without an effort. In this respect Wilson was highly favoured. Mr. Bateman pronounces his voice 'perfect;' and except the late Robert Newton, and *perhaps* Mr. Spurgeon, we do not remember to have heard any pulpit orator who could fill a large building like Islington church with equal ease to himself and pleasure to his auditors.

'At Worton,' says Mr. Bateman, 'his sermons were nearly, if not entirely, extemporary; his texts chosen from those which involve great

and primary truths, and, being clearly explained, and strongly enforced, were never forgotten. There are many old people still living who, though they cannot recall his sermons, will repeat his texts.....His illustrations were drawn from all common objects and occupations.

"'There you see,'" said one farmer to another, after a sermon on the resurrection, "he knows almost every thing. He told us truly how the seed dies afore it grows. He is not like our parson, who scarcely knows the difference between a cow and the moon."

'Alluding to the enclosure of Deddington Common, he said, "Mark! the way to heaven is not like an open common, with very many ways running through it, but a road fenced on both sides by the word of God."

"'He laid out the text so plain that every one could understand it, and spoke so loud that every one could hear,'" was the account given by Martha Gifford at eighty-one years of age, nearly half a century after his leaving; while an old family servant adds, "He was the finest preacher I ever heard; *he struck home so powerful*. I never heard any one like him. Remember, he used to say, that Satan is standing at the church porch to take away the good seed that has been sown in your hearts."—Vol. i., pp. 122-127.

'Pray do not let Mr. Wilson preach here again,' said a lady to her minister in an adjoining parish, 'he alarms one so.' These two witnesses are true. He could be as impressive in warning and appeal as any preacher to whom it has been our lot to listen. And he did not warn or invite in vain. His predecessor in the curacy of Worton had been a sportsman who rode 'across the country' on week-days after the hounds, and (we should imagine) on Sundays to do duty; for he performed five services every Sunday; 'so that,' as Mr. Bateman gravely tells us, 'the utmost speed was necessary.' Such a man was not likely to attract hearers; and the congregations (for Worton had two churches) consisted of about twenty people. But the fame of the new curate soon filled the country. In addition to the parishioners, all sorts of people came from the neighbourhood; they filled the school-room and the church-yards, and hung around the windows; gigs, carts, and horses were accommodated in his uncle's court-yard, and the pedestrians crowded the cottages. The population did not exceed two hundred; but in May, 1806, he writes to his friend Pearson, 'On Sunday last we had fifty-eight communicants;' and on one occasion there was no less than one hundred and sixty. In fine weather many of the people used to assemble between the services for singing and prayer. No less than three missionaries were raised up from among the once-neglected villagers; and by the kind co-operation of his father and sisters-in-law, Sunday-schools were established in his own and the surrounding

villages, and the whole neighbourhood supplied with Bibles and prayer-books.

These were great triumphs, and they were legitimate. He did not fill his church by bribing the poor with blankets, and shoes for their children; still less by carrying round, like a zealous curate of whom we have lately heard, packets of tea and tobacco, to be duly distributed on Monday to those who had abstained from the meeting-house on the previous day. The blind zeal which is more concerned to empty the Methodist chapel than the public-house, had no place in him. To exalt Christ was his great and constant aim, and God smiled on the earnest endeavour. His power in the pulpit arose neither from an affectation of novelty in his subjects, from oddities of manner, nor from the charms of an elaborately rhetorical style. 'Simple, grave, devout,' he sought for nothing new, and attempted nothing uncommon. But the 'signs following' showed that the old Gospel had not lost its efficacy even in the hands of a comparatively young man, any more than in those of the great leaders of the school in which he had been brought up. From the principles thus early laid down he never swerved; and for his fidelity in adhering to them under all circumstances, he has a just claim on our admiration and love. Thus he writes to a chaplain in India, more than thirty years afterwards:—

'Preach, as St. Paul did, "Christ" to the people. Be determined, as St. Paul was, to know nothing but "Jesus Christ and Him crucified." Glory in nothing, after St. Paul's example, "but in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." Ascribe every thing good in man, as St. Paul did, to God who "worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure." In a word, abase and humble the sinner—set forth the Saviour—promote and inculcate holiness.'—Vol. i., p. 382.

While his time passed pleasantly at Worton, he found trials at Oxford, and was not disinclined to listen to the urgent invitation addressed to him from St. John's, Bedford Row. For some time, until a successor could be found in the Vice-Principalship of his hall, he kept terms in the University, and spent the vacations in London. In 1812, he was able to give his undivided attention to the charge of that important congregation. Their old place of worship no longer exists; but we are glad that Mr. Bateman has preserved a sketch of it; for it is impossible to think of it without regret for its decay and consequent disappearance. Built by some parishioners of Dr. Sacheverel as a place of refuge from the torrents of High Church doctrine, with which they expected to be overwhelmed when he became rector of St. Andrew's, Holborn, and bearing unmistakeable tokens of the period at which it was built, unecclesiastical and clumsy

enough for the most zealous iconoclast of our times, it was yet a blessed spot, which some could scarcely enter or pass by, without being reminded of Cecil, of Pratt, of Wilson, of Jerram, and others, and thanking God for the multitudes who had been 'born there' through their faithful preaching. Daniel Wilson's description, in a single sentence, of the congregation to whom he ministered at St. John's will be found below; but Mr. Bateman's fuller account is interesting.

'Amongst the regular attendants were John Thornton and his sons, names suggestive of singular goodness and beneficence. There sat Charles Grant with his family, and two distinguished sons, the one afterwards, as Lord Glenelg, President of the Board of Control, and Secretary of State for the Colonies; the other, as Sir Robert Grant, Governor of Bombay. There also sat Zachary Macaulay, accompanied by his son, the legislative counsellor of India and historian of England, ennobling literature and now ennobled by it. Dr. Mason Good was there; a physician of high repute, the master of seventeen languages, and translator of the Psalms and the Book of Job, who, from a disciple of Belsham, was now "sitting at the feet of Jesus." Near him might be seen Mr. Stephen and his family, Mr. Cardall, Mr. Bainbridge, Mr. Wigg, Mr. Charles Bridges, and many others of high repute and piety. Lawyers of note also, who afterwards adorned the bench, were pew-holders in St. John's. The good Bishop Ryder often attended, and Lord Calthorpe, Mr. Bowdler, the "*facile princeps*," as he was termed, of the rising barristers of his day, and Sir Digby Mackworth. Mr. Wilberforce was frequently present, with his son Samuel, "to take care of him." The late Duchess of Beaufort also often sought to hear him, with many members of her family. Individuals of "every sort and condition" were thus assembled—high and low, rich and poor, one with another. Thirty or forty carriages might be often counted, during the London season, standing in triple rows about the doors; and though there was, as is too often unhappily the case in proprietary chapels, but scant accommodation for the poor, yet they loved to attend, and every vacant sitting-place was filled by them the moment the doors were opened.'—Vol. i., p. 178.

It is interesting to learn by what method the preacher prepared himself for those ministrations which were so largely influential both in the metropolis and throughout the country; and we have a very condensed description of his method by himself, and a full and elaborate one by his biographer. Both will be read with care by those who duly estimate the importance of the pulpit; and our ministerial readers especially will thank us for the extracts. Would that every one of them were in circumstances to follow his advice to his 'beloved Dealty,' at least in one respect, that, namely, of making Saturday a day of rest and refreshment, and thus preparing the outward man for the exhausting duties of the morrow. We have as little doubt that

this arrangement contributed much to the attainment of that good old age in which he finished his course, as we have that many valuable lives are sacrificed or shortened by the habit of working seven days in every week. If this is pernicious to statesmen,—and Mr. Wilberforce's *dictum* in reference to them is familiar to many of our readers,—is it likely to be less so to ministers, whose work is not seldom pursued under a deeper anxiety than statesmen ever know? That they should be willing to die in their work, and for their Master's sake, is undoubtedly true; but it is to the interest of the Church that the man who is willing to die for his Master should live to labour for Him as long as possible. The more willing he is to die, the more fit he is to live, and the less willing the people should be to let him die; and if their day of rest is his day of severest toil, they surely should not grudge him another in its stead. To return to Daniel Wilson.

'Let me affectionately remind you, my most truly beloved Dealtry, how Mr. Cecil for twenty-eight years, and I for sixteen, got on at St. John's. (1.) It was by steady and diligent preparation. (2.) Hard study. (3.) Texts chosen on the Sunday night and sermons begun on Monday morning. (4.) Matter collected from all our great authors during the early days of the week. (5.) Sermons finished on Friday. (6.) Saturdays left for the refreshment of the body by country air. (7.) Saturday night's assurances obtained by meditation and prayer on the preparation made for the following day.

'An immense congregation of acute lawyers, and busy curious merchants, amounting to nearly two thousand, can only be kept together, as a means under God, by such a course of solid, well-digested food carefully prepared.'—Vol. ii., pp. 387, 388.

'His sermons were thoroughly prepared, but only a few notes taken up into the pulpit. These notes were gradually enlarged, in order to lessen, as he was accustomed to say, the strain upon his mind; and, finally, the sermons were fully written, though not always preached as written. His mind was clear and his self-possession unruffled. Argument therefore readily mingled with exhortation, and exposition of Scripture was varied by appeals to the conscience. There were no set phrases to fill up gaps; no needless repetitions to spin out time; but all was clear, solid, natural, impressive, instructive. Occasionally there was hesitation for want of the right word; but the only effect of this was to excite the idea of fulness of matter and eagerness of purpose.'—Vol. i., p. 174.

'The sermons were often long, but that was deemed no grievance; and as he had no parochial charge, they were made the centre round which other duties revolved. Texts were selected on the Sunday evening or Monday morning, and his thoughts were then concentrated on them for that week. If a brother clergyman was met in the streets, the conversation would turn, not on the current news of the

day, but upon last or next Sunday's sermon;—What the text? What the treatment? What the effect? No labour was deemed too great. He had that peculiarity which characterizes every distinguished man—he was painstaking. He was always a student, and delighted in study. The body of the discourse was written in very large shorthand, so as to easily catch his eye, for he was very short-sighted in middle life; while the blank side was covered with extracts from critics, commentators, fathers, divines, and devotional writers of all kinds. This involved great labour, and must by no means be confounded with the “short and easy method” of looking at a commentator, adopting his comment, and from it framing his sermon. In one of his manuscript sermons, which had been several times preached, there are long extracts on the blank leaves from eight different authors; and six or seven sermons, examined promiscuously, show long quotations from fifty-nine different authorities: amongst them Vitranga, Luther, Lowth, Calvin, Scott, Henry, Maclaurin, Leighton, Davenant, Chrysostom, Cyprian, Daillé, Bishop Pearson, Dr. Wells, South, Milner, Mac-knight, Clement of Alexandria, Bourdaloue, Bishop Horsley, Waterland, Lardner, Blomfield, Butler, Girdlestone, Cecil, Hooker, Sumner, and Witsius. He had thus matter for many sermons under one cover, and upon the same text: and by varying the authorities he could, and did, vary to a great extent the tone and character of the discourse. Thus the sketch formed in his own mind was filled up with the great thoughts of great men, and what was original enriched from the stores of others. This power of adaptation is not common, but it was one of Daniel Wilson's peculiarities. He was always on the watch for useful points. A simple, pious, and unpretending French pastor was once brought to his study to be introduced to him. At St. Quentin, the place where this pastor ministered, a species of revival in religion had taken place, and through his instrumentality. He related the circumstances in a simple way, and particularly mentioned one sermon he had preached, which appeared to have produced a great effect upon his people. Mr. Wilson had listened with much interest up to this point; but the instant he heard of the sermon, out came pen and paper, and a rapid set of questions began. What was the text? What the divisions? What the plan of treatment? What the classes addressed? All was taken down avowedly for future use, in the hope that a similarly good effect might be again produced. Thus he gathered honey for his own hive from every quarter.

‘A register was kept of every sermon preached, with ruled columns, and short comments, such as:—

“Christmas Day, 1811.—I was very dry, cold, and lifeless. I did not seem to come home to the hearts of the people.”

“February 26th, 1812.—This was a most delightful service to my own mind.”

“November 16th, 1817.—Funeral sermon for the Princess Charlotte of Wales.”

“April 16th, 1820.—Sermon on Dean Milner's death.”

The extent of his labours 'in the word and doctrine' will appear from the following statement:—

'Before he went to St John's, he had preached six hundred and forty sermons. Whilst at St John's, he preached one thousand one hundred and eighty-seven sermons. At Islington he preached eight hundred and twenty.'

'At various places between the years 1801 and 1832 he preached seven hundred and eighty. Whilst at home on a visit from India, seventy-eight. And in India itself, two thousand three hundred and one. Making a total of five thousand eight hundred and six sermons! It is not meant that he composed that number of separate sermons; but that he had preached that number of times. Many sermons were preached eleven and twelve times, and many oftener still.'

'He was fond of courses of sermons, and preached them regularly on the Wednesday mornings during Lent, and at other times on the Sunday. Thus during successive Lents he preached on the Fifty-first Psalm, the temptation in the wilderness, our Lord's prayer, our Lord's passion, the Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, the Epistle to the Ephesians, the early chapters of the Acts, the books of Jonah and Ruth, the history of Hezekiah, the parable of the Marriage Supper, the thirteenth chapter of Corinthians, the work of the Holy Spirit. Some of these courses of sermons were wonderfully effective in his hands.'

'Many of his manuscripts were lost; many were published; many were stolen and destroyed by native servants in India; so that those now in existence are but like "two or three berries on the uppermost branches,"—reminiscences of "labours more abundant." He ever acted on the saying which was often on his lips:—"We may err in a thousand ecclesiastical matters, but we cannot be doing wrong in preaching the Gospel." This therefore was his delight, and here he was "instant in season and out of season," reproving, rebuking, and exhorting, "with all long-suffering and doctrine."—Vol. i., pp. 175-177.

Many pleasing instances of his success as a preacher are recorded. The following must suffice.

'All persons were not, of course, equally attracted. A first sermon did not always please: but let any one hear him a second time, or a third, and they seldom wished to hear any other preacher. "I will never go to hear that Daniel Wilson again," was the expression of a young man then training for the law, and making no profession of religion, now of mature age, unspotted reputation, and true piety, who had been persuaded to attend St. John's. But he did hear him again; and now his observation on retiring from the chapel was, "I will never hear anybody but Daniel Wilson, if I can help it." Failing in his endeavour to obtain a pew, he sat for six months upon one of the drop seats affixed to the outside of the pew-doors in the middle aisle; and there, amidst the crowd of worshippers, drank in the word of life.'

'It is told of another individual, now advanced in life, and distin-

guished both in the political and religious world, that when he first came up to London, to study for the bar, he casually (as men speak) entered St. John's chapel one Sunday evening. After standing for a long time in the aisle, and failing to get a seat, he felt vexed and chafed, and was retiring. One of the settled congregation, however, saw him going, followed him to the outer door, brought him back, and made room for him in his pew. The sermon that he then heard, was instrumental to his conversion, and he walked from thenceforth in the way that leadeth to everlasting life. The incident is not only encouraging to ministers, but instructive to pewholders: the opening of a door may lead to the salvation of a soul.'

'Another incident may also be noted. A near relative of Daniel Wilson was one of a large company, when a gentleman approached and sought a personal introduction. "I wished to be introduced," said he, in explanation, "to a relative of one to whom I owe everything for time and eternity. I am only one of very many who do not know and never spoke to Mr. Wilson, but to whom he has been a father in Christ. He never will know, and he never ought to know, the good he has been the means of doing; for no man could bear it."'

'Such incidents might be multiplied: but it needs not to those who know the power of Divine grace, and who remember the sure word of prophecy: "My word shall not return unto Me void; but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the things whereto I sent it." (Isai. lv. 11.) The celebrated Dr. Claudius Buchanan, writing in 1814, well expressed what many felt: "I rejoice to hear from time to time of your labours, and of the triumphs of the Gospel at the church of St. John's. It is a theatre of grander events than the general Congress."—Vol. i., pp. 179, 180.

'The number of communicants at St. John's was very large. Sometimes there were five hundred present at one time; and the average was three and four hundred, which would tell of a total amounting to six or seven hundred at the least. So greatly was the service protracted, that though the elements were administered to a whole rail of communicants at a time, a few minutes only intervened between the conclusion of the morning and commencement of the afternoon service.

'The collections made for religious and charitable purposes were very frequent and very large. No church in London surpassed St. John's in liberality; and those who were members of it tell now of the pleasure they felt, when in the year 1819, on the issue of a King's letter on behalf of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, their contributions exceeded the united contributions of St. James', Piccadilly, and St. George's, Hanover Square, and amounted to £157. 13s. 11d.

'The following list is really worthy to be held in remembrance:—

		£	s.	d.
Feb. 5th, 1812.	Collection for British prisoners in France	106	15	9
March 13th, 1814.	For the Germans suffering from the French war	262	0	0
Aug. 13th, 1815.	For the sufferers after the battle of Waterloo	214	0	0
Nov. 9th, 1817.	For District Visiting Society	193	4	6

Nov. 19th, 1817.	British and Foreign Bible Society, Wednesday morning	114	14	8
March 29th, 1818.	For Church Missionary Society	208	12	9
Jan. 31st, 1819.	For St. Andrew's Parochial Schools.....	88	1	9
May 23rd, 1819.	For Welsh Schools	114	16	2
Sept. 19th, 1822.	For the Jews' Society.....	125	10	5

'These are extracted from his own notes, as specimens of what the congregation contributed, and as proofs that they were "fruitful in all good works."

'His appeals were very urgent; for though he had perfect confidence in his own people, yet many strangers were always present, and he was not willing that any should escape. His words on one occasion will illustrate his plain speaking and power over conscience; the echo of them might even now do good to grudging Christians. He was pleading the cause of charity, and closed by saying, "Some will, I fear, notwithstanding what I have urged, pass the plate and give nothing, thinking *nobody sees*. I tell you—I tell such an one—God SEES."—Vol. i., pp. 182–184.

We confess to having lingered over this portion of Wilson's Life with more emotion than consists with the Rhadamanthine sternness which is supposed to characterize our craft. A more glorious post of duty than the pulpit of St. John's could scarcely be desired by any minister. For numbers, wealth, social position, and influence, there were few congregations in England to compare with Wilson's; and we love to remember how the 'word of the Lord' was 'glorified' within those old walls; how the evangelical party in the Established Church was strengthened for its early struggles, and aided in its progress towards its present encouraging position, both by the direct and reflex influence of the powerful ministry which he exercised. It was no idle boast that Dr. Buchanan uttered. The work of the Congress of Vienna is even now undone in part, and threatened with a fuller undoing; but the work done at St. John's, Bedford Row, will abide when 'the heavens are no more.'

Although no parochial charge was connected with this chapel, Wilson's work was by no means confined to the congregation. So powerful a preacher was in great request, and he was willing to do whatever he could for his Master. The claims of the religious societies appear to have had priority in his judgment; and very properly; for by means of them every man's influence for good may be indefinitely augmented. In the Christian Knowledge Society he was active and useful, particularly in a controversy now almost forgotten, on the subject of Baptismal Regeneration. His boldness for the truth was conspicuous. Having to preach in his turn before the University of Oxford, he unfurled the banner from St. Mary's pulpit, and showed the difference between the regeneration insisted upon by our Saviour, and the change connected with admission into the

Church. His sermon was not allowed to be printed at the University press; but that is a small thing in our days. It went through five editions, and he and his coadjutors compelled Dr. Mant (afterwards Bishop of Down and Connor) to alter the tract which had given them offence. The Bible Society received much of his help, when such help was more valuable than now. At Oxford, particularly, his former position enabled him to serve it much; and every where his eloquence was effective. The Church Missionary Society commanded his earnest sympathy, and his collection for it, when he preached the annual sermon, was the largest ever made up to that time. He visited many places as a deputation, always with good effect; but his best service was probably done with his pen. When the Arch-deacon of Bath publicly protested against the formation of an Auxiliary Society in that city, Daniel Wilson, at the request of the Parent Committee, published an able pamphlet in vindication of the Society, which the protesting dignitary had the good sense to forbear to reply to. It passed through seventeen editions, and proved very useful to the good cause.

His other publications were numerous. Passing by occasional discourses, we note a volume of Sermons which were sold off in a fortnight, and the profits of which reached the extraordinary sum of six hundred pounds; two volumes of Letters, the record of a Tour on the Continent, rendered necessary by his failing health, which were very acceptable to the public; and two more on the Evidences of Christianity, which competent judges still praise as a compact summary, prepared with becoming care, and well adapted to the time at which they appeared. Another volume of Sermons preached in India, and a volume of Expository Discourses on the Epistle to the Colossians, attest his diligence as a preacher, and his zealous concern for the 'truth of the Gospel' in advancing years; while his nine Charges to his Clergy have their own peculiar value; and one, having been reprinted in a cheap form in England, did good service against the Tractarians at an early period of the struggle.

But his most useful publication is an Essay prefixed to the edition of *Butler's Analogy*, published in Mr. Collins's series of *Select Christian Authors*; in which he first gives an able analysis of the book, and then argues that it would have lost nothing, but rather gained in value, had its author represented Christianity in its full extent of evangelical privilege. We have long wished that this masterly dissertation could be prefixed to every edition of the *Analogy*, and now see with great pleasure the testimony borne to its value in these pages not only by Bishop Sumner, though he must be accounted no mean judge, but particularly by Bishop Copleston, one of the most accom-

plished men of his day, who, while he justified Butler for not carrying his argument further, admits that he 'has fallen short of that view of Christianity, which is most effectual in subduing the heart' and training men for heaven; and states that the original portion of the Essay is 'excellent, and will be of great practical use.'

The period which Wilson spent as Vicar of Islington, is chiefly memorable for the commencement of that great work of church-building which has gone forward so prosperously ever since. His zeal, courage, and perseverance were truly admirable. Seldom, if ever, within our memory, has there been a better example of successful religious enterprise. He found two churches in his parish, and left five; these, under the vigilant care of his son, have increased to seventeen. An eighteenth is building; and when it is complete, 27,000 sittings will have been provided. Two iron churches and two school churches are not included in this enumeration. The parochial clergy are forty in number, and sixteen more are resident, in various capacities, and doubtless render occasional assistance; so that the parish is become a little diocese; but the great work was the beginning. And, calling to mind the state of things he found there, and the reception at first accorded to his proposal to build three churches, we are less surprised at the present seventeen churches than at the 'first three.'

At this point in his history, he might be supposed to have reached the summit of earthly happiness. In a highly respectable position, a justly popular preacher, with full occupation, and ample scope for his talents, a permanent and competent income, fair health, and an attached and hopeful family, there was surely little left to be desired on this side the final resting-place. But greater things were in store for him in the disposal of Divine Providence. One talent having been improved to five, the five were to be made ten in a higher sphere. Thus it will ever be, as the parable to which we have alluded seems plainly to teach. The reward bestowed upon fidelity and diligence is not to be repose and inaction, but translation to some sphere of more responsible and extended service. Accordingly, one Sunday evening, towards the end of the year 1831, while engaged in prayer, he felt a desire spring up in his mind to offer himself for what he truly calls a 'missionary bishopric.' The see of Calcutta was vacant. Middleton, James, Heber, Turner, had all died within nine years, and considerable difficulty was experienced in finding a successor to the last-named, when this thought suggested itself to him, or, as it would be more correct to say, was suggested by Him 'from whom all holy counsels and good desires' proceed. After much prayer and consultation, his way

was made plain, and his consecration took place in April, 1832. He departed in June following, and, after a short stay at the Cape of Good Hope, where he exercised episcopal functions, landed in Calcutta in November. He was then in the fifty-fourth year of his age, and the thirty-first of his ministry; and when we think of what he resigned, and of what he undertook, we recognise in him an example of missionary zeal and devotedness worthy of the apostolic age.

His diocese included the whole of India, with the Cape of Good Hope and New South Wales attached; and, unless we are much mistaken, it now supplies employment to more than twenty episcopal labourers. But, undeterred by its vastness, its distance from home, the peculiarities of its peoples, or any other causes of difficulty, he set to work to administer it as best he could, resolving to live for India, and to die in India. One short visit to England was found needful to restore his wasted health; but, with that exception, he remained at his post, and was favoured to continue his labours for a quarter of a century. To the history of this period nearly two-thirds of the work before us is devoted, and the details supplied by Mr. Bateman are in no common measure diversified and instructive. We follow his course from year to year with wonder and delight. In the third year after his arrival, he commenced the visitation of his diocese. Penang, Singapore, Moulmein, Ceylon, Madras, Vizagapatam, Pooree, occupied him six months and seven days; six thousand five hundred miles were traversed, and eighty sermons preached. Next year he embarked for Quilon, visited the Syrian Churches in Travancore, the Jews in Cochin, the Romanists at Goa, and finally Bombay, whence he journeyed through the Upper Provinces of India, to Simlah, where he rested during the rainy season. Resuming his visitation, when the weather permitted, he reached Roopur, embarked on the Sutlej to Lodianah, visited Lahore, Delhi, Cawnpore, Allahabad, and returned to Calcutta, having travelled seven thousand miles. A few gaps were left in his route, and these were filled up by a short tour, undertaken a month or two after his return, and thus his primary visitation was completed. A year afterwards we find him beginning the second at Madras, where he delivered the charge, already referred to, as a protest against the Tractarian theology. He returned to Calcutta in November, having visited Penang, Singapore, and Chittagong. Three months afterwards we find him again at Delhi, Lucknow, and those other places with the names of which recent events have made us sadly familiar, and, after another three months, at Simlah again. When the rains ceased, he returned to Delhi, Agra, Gwalior, Allahabad, and completed his second visitation

in April, 1841. The archdeaconries of Madras and Bombay had now been erected into distinct sees, which he was henceforth to visit every five years, as metropolitan: accordingly he began this work in 1842, leaving Calcutta in August, and returning in May, 1843, after a journey of eight thousand seven hundred miles by land and water. In October he set forth once more, and worked his way up to the hill country in April, where he wrought hard at a volume of Lectures, and at his correspondence, till it was time to return to Calcutta. On his journey down he contracted the illness which rendered his return to England necessary. He did not, however, embark until he had written to his children, and laid upon them 'his solemn charge not to attempt, either by word or deed, to influence his mind, or persuade him to relinquish his conscientious purpose of returning to India.' He came home to rest; but, in fourteen months, he delivered sixty-one sermons and addresses, mostly on very important public occasions, and some of great length, and characterized by surpassing force. He returned to visit his diocese a fifth time. From Singapore he went on to Borneo, and, when found at Calcutta again in March, 1851, recounts that in his absence he had preached thirty-five sermons, held ten confirmations, consecrated three churches, written one hundred and fifty letters, and traversed five thousand one hundred miles. A sixth visitation was completed by the aid of Bishop Dealtry. In the seventh he visited Burmah, Ceylon, Madras; but the mutiny rendered all arrangements for the Upper Provinces null and void, and he occupied himself with his duties at Calcutta, till the hour of his release arrived in January, 1858.

Those who suppose a bishopric to be a sinecure, may at least learn from this itinerary how he who would be chief must be the servant of all. We cannot attempt even any fuller sketch of his ceaseless labours. At every place he found work, or made it. Deficiencies were to be supplied, labourers provided for destitute places, differences settled, plans of extension arranged, the weak encouraged, the erring rebuked, sermons preached, confirmations or ordinations held, and all that was important reported to the Societies at home. His correspondence alone would have been work enough for some men. His Journal Letters, which make him to a great extent the reporter of his own proceedings, are peculiarly valuable, and have repeatedly recalled to our remembrance the Journals of Wesley. They show the same untiring activity, record the like perpetual preaching and travelling, interspersed with the same lively sketches of scenery and manners, amusing incidents and anecdotes, and notices of books more full, condensed, and striking, if possible, than those of the great Founder

of Methodism. In some respects they are decidedly superior. They show us more of the inner life of the man. We do not wonder at the difference; for Wesley was not demonstrative, and he wrote for the public, while Wilson was, and wrote for his family. We observe the difference with pleasure. It is now abundantly manifest that the true secret of Wilson's strength lay in his closet devotions. Like Wesley, he set apart an hour morning and evening for retirement, and there refreshed himself for the duties and conflicts of life. His deep self-abasement, his incessant perusal of the Scriptures, his earnest prayer, enabled him to fill every post, however toilsome, and to accomplish whatever he undertook with credit and success. In Wesley's case we believe all this, or infer it from what we otherwise know, in Wilson's we see it. The *Sacra Privata* of Bishop Thomas Wilson have long afforded edification to the Church; but the volumes before us would supply a still more profitable compilation. How beautiful are the meditations written in a storm at sea, which threatened to bring his episcopal labours to an early close!

'Friday, December 4th, 1834.—God's will be done. The Lord sitteth above the water floods, yea, the Lord "abideth a King for ever." When Jesus had compelled His disciples to go into a ship, the storm nevertheless arose, and they were nigh to perishing. But Jesus was on the mountain praying for them. Jesus saw them when in jeopardy. Jesus came to them at the critical moment, saying, "It is I, be not afraid."...In the same Jesus, everywhere present, and working by His never-failing Providence, I would desire to trust. Before Him would I humble myself; His mercy would I implore; confessing my grievous sins, relying on His precious death, and resigning myself into His almighty hands. Lord, save, we perish....Afflictions are the portion of the militant Church. They humble, lay low, show us our weakness, bring our sins to remembrance, awaken conscience, place eternity at the door. At this moment any increase of storm might expose us to the most direct and imminent danger; whilst, at any instant, Jesus may arise, say, "Peace, be still!" and there would be a great calm. This is the moment, then, to glorify Jesus by faith in His power and love, to lie in His hands as clay in the hands of the potter, to be assured that "all is well!" to look with more scrutiny into the heart, and to put away every sin. Heaven is a state of holiness; Christ is the most holy Saviour; God is a holy God. Am I then holy? fit for heaven? really sanctified by the truth? separated from every sin? devoted to the whole will of God? Lord, make me so more and more! Give me the scriptural evidences of a true faith! Shine upon Thy work in my heart!'—Vol. i., pp. 422, 423.

How instructive his entry on the anniversary of his election, 1836 !—

‘I have been reading over, as is my annual custom, my notes, made in 1832 and subsequent years, and the Consecration Service, in order to affect my mind with these mercies ; and in order to learn penitential sorrow and shame for my countless defects, sins, and provocations, and that I may seek for more grace for the short and uncertain period of remaining service, that “Christ may be glorified in my body” somewhat more this year, “whether it be by life, or death.”... Publicity, external duties, talk, misrepresentation, reliance on an arm of flesh, the opinions of men, party spirit, divisions, fear of human judgment, secularity, worldly-mindedness, are amongst the evils I would most desire to shun. And I would learn retirement, internal duties, silence, reliance on the approbation of God, frankness, truth, integrity, simplicity, spirituality, deadness of heart to the world and the creature, submission under the cross, union with Christ, preparation for “that day.” Amen! amen!’—Vol. ii., p. 103.

And then, how touching his record at the decease of Sir B. Malkin !—

‘Calcutta is desolate; his family and circle of friends are desolate; the many religious and benevolent institutions he nourished are bereaved of one of their purest, ablest, sweetest, and most valuable members. O that I may “hear the rod, and who hath appointed it!” My daughter gone, my son and chaplain gone, Dr. Mill gone,—my most intimate friend now gone! Blessed Jesus, be Thou ALL to me: daughter, son, chaplain, adviser, friend! Thou all-sufficient Saviour, whose self-existence, and infinite fulness for the supply of those that trust in Thee, is declared in Thy name, I AM THAT I AM,—be Thou my refuge!’—Vol. ii., p. 142.

His candour in the admission of errors, and his thankfulness for the advice of friends, are manifest in his correspondence, particularly in the letters to his early friends, Pearson and Cunningham; and these communications appear to us to supply the best answer to the reproach sometimes cast upon him, of having become ‘High-Church.’ Doubtless he was not less strict in the administration of affairs as he grew older; and those who were able to compare the minister of St. John’s, who had no parochial responsibilities, with the vicar of Islington, who had very large ones, and the Oriental Bishop, who had still larger, and was withal obliged to maintain a considerable establishment, would often make comparisons to the disadvantage of the latter; but it does not appear that he ever departed from the principles on which he set out, or was at any time disposed to sacrifice truth and love to churchmanship. A little stately

he assuredly was. Had he been a player, we should have said he sometimes overacted his part. But his intense earnestness will excuse him to every well-constituted mind, especially as his biographer makes no attempt to conceal this foible, if he does not himself smile complacently at the thought of the 'glossy cassock and starched cravat' drenched in the surf at Madras. When Mr. Bateman writes of unadvised words occasionally uttered, both in private and in public, he only shows that he is writing of a saint, not an angel; and when he tells us of occasional peculiarities of manner and expression, he narrates what one would expect from a pupil of John Newton and Cecil, even if that pupil had not been a man of amazing energy.

We have read of bishops who have accumulated large fortunes to the scandal of the Church; and of officers, both civil and military, who, after spending a quarter of a century in India, have returned to enjoy themselves upon an ample fortune; but Bishop Wilson's case is unique. He would neither return to England, nor accumulate for his children. His salary and allowances were fixed at a handsome, though by no means extravagant, amount; and it is computed that his total receipts from the Company amounted to 'something like £140,000.' But his givings were proportionate. He maintains a modest reserve on the subject of his charities, and Mr. Bateman follows his example. But by occasional disclosures we learn the truth. In one four months he gave away, in passing and occasional charities, half the income of the period. To all proper public objects he was a willing and a large contributor; and his bounty reached to English charities both national and parochial. He furnished handsomely the palace he found empty, and bequeathed its contents to his successors in perpetuity. The erection of a cathedral church lay very near his heart, and he appropriated to it first a sum of £5,000, which he had almost promised to his children; and by successive donations raised the amount to more than four times that sum. He left behind him very little more than £6,000; and his bequests to various charities amount to above a third even of that small fortune. Well did he exemplify the apostolic rule, which might, indeed, have formed the motto to these volumes: 'Having gifts differing according to the grace given us, whether ministry, let us wait on our ministering: or he that teacheth, on teaching: he that giveth, let him do it liberally; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that showeth mercy, with cheerfulness.'

Many subjects of interest crowd upon us as we draw to a close. We had reserved for this place some remarks on certain of the

Bishop's views on questions of religious experience; on his visits to the Syrian Churches, where he appears to great advantage; and also on his dealing with the great caste question, in which he was a pattern to civil as well as ecclesiastical governors, wise, temperate, firm, Christian throughout. But our space is exhausted, and we will only add a wish that every future metropolitan of India may prove a worthy successor of DANIEL WILSON.

ART. VIII.—*Domestic Annals of Scotland. From the Reformation to the Revolution.* By ROBERT CHAMBERS, F.R.S.E., &c. Second Edition. Two Vols. 8vo. Edinburgh and London: W. and R. Chambers. 1859.

WHOEVER has had experience in historical inquiries must have remarked how much more readily a true impression of any given period is to be derived from the perusal of contemporaneous documents, than from the most able narrative, written long after the period. The controversial writings and private letters of Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin, if more tedious and voluminous than the sparkling *résumé* of D'Aubigné, enable the student to realize more vividly the actual scenes of the great drama. To comprehend fully the striking and protracted duel between the court and the parliament, which ended in replacing a decapitated King by a Protector and Commonwealth, we must wade knee-deep into the mass of pamphlets, gravely controversial or bitterly satirical, of which such ample collections are found in sundry of our public libraries.

These volumes of Mr. Chambers, derived and condensed from a variety of contemporary or nearly contemporary sources, enable the reader to form a tolerable judgment of the public and domestic condition of Scotland during nearly two centuries. They appear to have been selected with much fairness, no attempt being made to conceal or explain away the bare and rugged features of a country, a people, and a period, in comparison of which the contemporaneous state of the greater part of Europe might be considered both tame and polished. The extent and fragmentary character of the work, consisting of a multitude of paragraphs on a vast variety of topics, seem to dictate the mode in which alone we can bring the work before our readers. To endeavour to generalize upon such *disjecta membra* of national history would quite defeat our present

homely purpose, which shuns both philosophic dulness and pretension. We shall rather seek to exhibit the plan of the work, and the nature of its contents, by arranging and condensing some of its information on certain points. We shall thus, we trust, interest the reader, and inspire him with the wish to avail himself of the further stores accumulated and arranged by Mr. Chambers.

In regard to the growth of commercial enterprise and the progress of manufactures, some interesting facts are recorded. Previous to the reign of James VI. many of the articles of domestic use now largely manufactured in Scotland, had been introduced by merchants from abroad. Paper, glass, tanned leather, and soap, were of this number. This reign is the era of the first attempts at a native manufacture of all those articles. Whilst James was absent on his matrimonial visit to Denmark, Feb. 1589-90, we first hear of a native manufacture of paper. Peter Groot Heros, a German, and sundry unnamed persons associated with him, promised to set up this art in Scotland, under favour of certain encouragements which they demanded from the Government. On what river they meant to plant their work does not appear. We only find that the Lords of Council were willing to promote the object, calculating that thus would paper be made cheaper than hitherto, and also that by and by the natives would be enabled to become paper-makers themselves.

They granted to Peter and his co-partners liberty to carry on the manufacture of paper in Scotland for nine years, without competition, personally free from the duties of watching, warding, and tax-paying, and 'under his majesty's special protection, maintenance, defence, and sure safeguard.' The only condition imposed was, that they should begin their work before the ensuing 1st of August, and carry it on constantly during the time for which the privilege was granted; otherwise the licence should be of none effect.

It is pleasant to find another matter betokening the progress of literature and intelligence only a few days after the licence for paper-making. Andro Hart then carried on the business of a bookseller in Edinburgh, and his name appears on so many interesting title-pages, that he is really a notable man of the time. He and John Morton, Englishman, now sent a petition to the Privy Council, setting forth 'what hurt the lieges of this realm susteint through the scarcity of buiks and volumes of all sorts,' and to what exorbitant prices those had risen which were brought from England. They, 'upon an earnest zeal to the

propagation and inness of vertue and letters within this realm, had, two years ago, enterprisit the hame-bringing of volumes and buiks furth of Almane and Germanie, fra the whilk parts the maist part of the best volumes in England are brought, and in this trade have so behavit themselves that this town is furnisht with better buiks and volumes nor it was at any time heretofore; and the said volumes sauld by them in this country are als guid cheap as they are to be sauld in London or any other part of England, to the great ease and commodity of all estates of persons within this realm.' Behold, however, John Gourlay, the customer, (that is, farmer of customs,) had laid hands upon the books which Hart and Morton were importing, and demanded that they should pay a duty,—a demand altogether unprecedented. 'Upon the like complaint made by Thomas Vautrollier, printer, he obtaint ane decret discharging the provost and bailies of this burgh and their customer fra all asking of ony customs for ony buiks sauld or to be sauld by him.' The present petitioners only demanded to be so treated likewise. It is gratifying to find that the lords unhesitatingly granted the prayer of the two booksellers, so that the books they imported from Germany would thenceforth be duty-free.

In August, 1625, a proclamation was resolved on for a strict execution of the laws against the selling of tallow out of the country. Contrary to the views of modern mercantile men, there was a general fear and dislike in those days regarding export trade. It was always thought to have a bad effect in making things scarce and dear at home. No one seemed ever to have dreamed of the profitable *quid pro quo*, without which the trade could not have been carried on. We require to have a full conception of this universal delusion, before we can understand the frame of mind under which the Privy Council of the day could speak of the transport of tallow as 'a crime most pernicious and wicked,' perpetrated by a set of 'godless and avaritious persons,' acting 'without regard of honesty or of those common duties of civil conversation whilk in a good conscience they ought to carry in the estate.' It was, to all appearance, under a sincere horror for 'this mischievous and wicked trade,' which threatened to leave not enough of tallow to supply the needs of the population, that the lords announced their resolution to punish it with confiscation of all the remaining moveable goods of the guilty parties.

So late as July, 1687, we find that, in compliance with 'a general outcry and complaint' from the public, the magistrates of Edinburgh called up the butchers and vintners, and fined

them for extortion. It was in vain that these men set forth that there was no rule or law broken, and that when they bought dear they must sell dear. It was held as a sufficient answer to the butchers, that they did exact large profits, besides using sundry arts to pass off their meat as better than it was; and they *regreted the market* by taking all the parks and enclosures about Edinburgh, so as to prevent any from 'furnishing' but themselves. It was alleged of the vintners, that they exacted for a prepared fowl triple what it cost in the market; they sold bread purposely made small; they charged twenty-four pence (Scots) for the pound of sugar, while the cost to themselves was eight-pence, 'and even so in the measure of tobacco.' To this account, derived from Sir John Lauder, of Fountainhall, Mr. Chambers adds the following remarks: 'Though the butchers formed one of the fourteen incorporated trades of Edinburgh, their business was of a limited description, and, indeed, continued so till a comparatively recent time, owing to the generally prevalent use of meat salted at Martinmas, a practice rendered unavoidable by the scarcity of winter fodder for cattle before the days of turnip husbandry. Of the animals used, cattle formed but a small proportion. John Strachan, a "flesh-caddy," or market-porter, who died in 1791, in the hundred-and-fifth year of his age, remembered the time, not long after that now under attention, "when no flesher would venture to kill any beast (that is, bullock) till all the different parts were bespoken." It may also be remarked that Pennant, in his *Tour in Scotland*, 1772, tells us that "the gentleman is now living who first introduced stall-fed beef into Perth." He adds, with strict truth, "Before that time the greater part of Scotland lived on salt meat throughout the winter, as the natives of the Hebrides do at present, and as the English did in the feudal times."

The following account by an Englishman, apparently a military officer, gives us a further insight into the habits of the Scotch people towards the end of the seventeenth century: 'Their drink,' he says, 'is beer, sometimes so new that it is scarce cold when brought to table. But their gentry are better provided, and give it age, yet think not so well of it as to let it go alone, and therefore add brandy, cherry brandy, or brandy and sugar; and (this) is the nectar of their country, at their feasts and entertainments, and carries with it a mark of great esteem and affection. Sometimes they have wine, a thin-bodied claret, at tenpence the mutchkin, which answers our quart. They are fond of tobacco, but more from the sneesh-box (snuff-box) than the pipe. And they have made it so neces-

sary, that I have heard some of them say that, should their bread come in competition with it, they would rather fast than their *sneesh* should be taken away. Yet mostly it consists of the coarsest tobacco, dried by the fire, and powdered in a little engine after the form of a *tap*, which they carry in their pockets, and is both a *mill* to grind, and a box to keep it in.'

The public and private conduct of the upper classes,—their amusements, family quarrels, and pecuniary and other embarrassments,—find many illustrations in these volumes. Let us begin with His Majesty King James, who was fond of sport, and had a royal free and easy way of gratifying it. This curiously appears from the terms in which he addressed a gentleman whose hawk he deigned to covet: 'Hearing that ye have ane gyre-falcon, whilk is esteemed the best hawk in all that country, and meetest for us that have sae guid liking of that pastime, we have, therefore, taken occasion effectuously to requeest and desire you, *seeing hawks are but gifting geir*, and not otherwise to be accounted betwixt us and you, being sae well acquainted, that of courtesy ye will bestow on us that goshawk, and send her here to us with this bearer, our servant, whom we have on this errand directed to bring and carry her tenderly. Wherein, as he sall report our hearty and special thanks, sae shall ye find us ready to requite your courtesy and good will with nae less pleasure in any the like gates (ways) as occasion sall present.' Serious correspondence takes place with reference to the procuring of birds, and messengers are sent up and down the country on the same important mission. In a letter of the Earl of Errol, he tells the King, 'Your Majesty's mongrel falcon, whilk I have, sould have been at your hieness lang or now (ere now), but that as my falconer was ready to take his journey, she contracted ane disease, wherewith he durst not adventure to travel her, in respect of the great frosts and storms. I will be answerable to your Majesty that she has been in nae ways stressed, but as weel treated as any hawk could be. Naither sall your Majesty suspect that I have retein it her for my awn plesure, whilk I sall never compare in the greatest thing whatsoever with your Majesty's meanest contentment; nor am I able as yet, even at this present, to travel upon the fields for any game. Albeit, how soon it sall be possible that the hawk may in any sort be travellit, she sall be at your Majesty with all diligence. She had the same sickness the last year, in this same season, and was not free of it till near March.'

The King, however, did not confine his broad hints or impor-

fortunate demands to such simple matters as a hawk. When he was expecting his bride from Denmark, and thinking anxiously about the attendant expenses of fêtes and feasting, he writes pressing letters to all persons of substance who bore him any good will, for contributions of means towards the proper outset of the Court on the occasion. From the Laird Barnbarroch he entreated 'sic quantity of fat beef and mutton on foot, wild fowls, and venison, or other stuff meet for this purpose, as possibly ye may provide and furnish of your awn or by your moeyen.' On the 2nd of September, (1589,) he wrote to Boswell of Balmonto a pressing, pleading letter for the loan of a thousand merks, stating that he had been disappointed of money by any more regular course, on account of its 'scarcity in thir quarters,' and expressing his assurance that he, the laird, would 'rather hurt yourself very far than see the dishonour of your prince and native country.'

The early part of the reign of this good-natured, but weak and pedantic, King, affords a fair sample of his mode of interfering with the differences of his nobles. Many of his nobility were at feud with each other on account of past grievances. For example, Glamis bore deadly hatred against the Earl of Crawford, in consequence of the killing of his father by some of Crawford's people at Stirling in 1578. With the Earl of Angus, whose piety and love of the clergy induced James to call him *the ministers' king*, it was sufficient ground of hostility against the Earl of Montrose that he had sat as chancellor on the jury that adjudged Morton to the 'maiden.' The earls of Huntly and Marischal had some mutual grudge of their own, perhaps little intelligible to southern men. So it was with others. The nobility being now assembled at a convention, James, who never could check outrages amongst them by the sword of justice, did what a good-natured, weak man could to induce them to be reconciled to each other, and call it peace when there was no peace. Assembling them all at a banquet in Holyrood on a Sunday, he drank to them thrice, and solemnly called on them to maintain concord, threatening to be an enemy to him who should first disobey the injunction. Next day, after supper, then an early meal, and after 'many scrolls' had been drunk to each other, he made them all march in procession, 'in their doublets,' up the Cannongate, two and two, holding by each other's hands, and each pair being a couple of reconciled enemies. He himself went in front, with Lord Hamilton on his right hand, and the Lord Chancellor Maitland on the left; next after, the Duke of Lennox and Lord Claud Hamilton; then

Angus and Montrose, Huntly and Marischal, Crawford and the Master of Glamis. Coming to the Tolbooth, His Majesty ordered all the prisoners for debt to be released. Thence he advanced to the picturesque old market-cross, covered with tapestry for the occasion, and where the magistrates had set out a long table well furnished with bread, wine, and sweetmeats. Amidst the blare of trumpets, and the boom of cannon, the young monarch publicly drank to his nobles, wishing them peace and happiness, and made them all drink to each other. The people, long accustomed to sights of bloody contention, looked on with unspeakable joy, danced, broke into songs of mirth, and brought out all imaginable instruments to give additional, albeit discordant, expression to their happiness. All acknowledged that no such sight had ever been seen in Edinburgh. In the general transport, the gloomy gibbet, usually kept standing there in readiness, was cast down, as if it could never again be needed. Sweetmeats, and glasses from which toasts had been drunk, flew about both from the table of the feast and from the responsive parties on the *fore-stairs*.

When all was done, the King and nobles returned in the same form as they had come. Notwithstanding these promising appearances, in spite of this rose-water treatment of a severe chronic ailment of the body corporate, we gather from Mr. Chambers that in less than two months six or seven of the nobles quarrelled about priority of voting, and Lord Home passed a challenge to Lord Fleming,—‘wha were not sufferit to fecht, albeit they were baith weel willing.’

These personal and family feuds, attended with violence, are conspicuous features in these annals. In the sixteenth century, the families of Montgomery and Cunningham were the Montagues and Capulets of Ayrshire. The feud had sprung up nearly a hundred years before, in consequence of the Earl of Glencairn disputing the title of the Earl of Eglintoun to the bailiery of the district of Cunningham. There had been attempts at a stanching of the feud, and even a marriage had been proposed by way of fixing the parties in amity; but at a time when peace had nearly been effected, enmity was renewed in consequence of a Montgomery killing a Cunningham in self-defence.

‘The Cunninghams, being grieved hereat, made presently a vow that they should be avenged upon the fattest of the Montgomeries (for these were their words) for that fact. This vow was sae acceptable to them all, that a bond was concludit, subscrivit with the chiefest of their hands, to slay the young Earl (of Eglintoun) by whatsoever mean could be devisit, and that whosoever wold take the turn in hand,

and perform it, he sould not only be sustenit upon the common expenses of the rest, but sould also be maintenit and defendit by them all from danger and skaith. At last ane Cunningham, of Robertland, took the enterprise in hand, whilk he accomplished in this manner:—

‘Twa year before his treasonable attempt, he insinuated himself in familiarity and all dutiful service to the said young Earl, whereby he moved him to take pleasure without ony suspicion, till he conquest (acquired) sic favour at his hand, that neither the gold, money, horses, armour, clothes, counsel, or voyage was hid from him, that this same Robertland was made sae participant of them all, even as though they had been his own; and besides all this, the confidence and favour that the Earl shew unto him was sae great, that he preferred him to be his awn bed-fellow. Hereat Lord Hugo, auld Earl of Eglintoun, took great suspicion, and therefore admonist his son in a fatherly manner to beware of sic society, whilk, without all doubt, wad turn to his skaith; for he knew weel the nature of these Cunninghams to be subtle and false, and therefore willit him to give them nae traist, but to avoid their company altogether, even as he lovit his awn life, or wald deserve his fatherly blessing. To this counsel the son gave little regard; but that was to his pains; and the domestic enemy was sae crafty indeed, that he wald attempt naething during the life of the father for many respects. But within short time thereafter, (the father died June, 1585,) as the noble Earl was passing a short way in pastime, accompanied with a very few of his household servants, and evil horsit himself, Robertland, accompanied with sixty armed men, came running furiously against him on horseback; and the earl, fearing the thing that followit, spurrit his horse to have fled away. His servants all fled another way, and he was left alone. The horsemen ran all upon him, and unmercifully killed him with shots of guns and strokes of swords.’

When this odious murder was reported to the King, he caused the malefactors to be brought to trial. Meanwhile, they had all fled beyond sea. He then ordered their houses to be rendered to the Earl’s brother, to be demolished or otherwise. Shortly after, on his matrimonial visit to Denmark, the pardon of Robertland was requested by the young Queen, and was consented to; he was received into favour in the presence of the courtiers, and, after his return to Scotland in the Queen’s suite, was appointed to an office in His Majesty’s stables.

Of the stern ecclesiastical discipline which has marked the post-Reformation period of Scotland with some of the darkest spots of Church history, there are here ample records. Moral improvements were attempted to be enforced by secular means, and liberty of conscience was as much ignored as in the times of papal supremacy. Not only was such outward vice as might

be supposed to have an injurious effect on public morals or decency restrained by penal laws, but the spirit of the Gospel was so far misrepresented, that the individual belief and conduct were cruelly overruled by the Church and secular authorities. To be absent any considerable number of times from church; to refuse to take the covenant, or to have any dealings with the loyalist, Huntley,—these were amongst the offences for which the sentence of excommunication was not unfrequently passed, a doom inferring a loss of all civil rights, and a complete separation from human converse. Old women using charms for healing, persons 'kindling needfire' for the cure of cattle, or reserving a field for the devil, (the *Guidman's Croft*,) and females pilgrimizing to holy wells, according to old custom, were all vigorously proceeded against, in obedience to repeated acts of the General Assembly, for uprooting of *all superstition*. Irregularities between the sexes, and even quarrelling and scolding, had to be expiated in sackcloth before the congregation. Drunkenness and swearing were more than censured. In dealing with these offences, an unsparing inquisition into domestic and family matters was used, and no rank, age, or sex seems to have afforded the subject any protection.

The case of Lady Frendraught is a fair illustration of the truth of the above statements, and we may conclude that those of inferior rank would be treated with still greater harshness. Her ladyship resided at Kinnairdrie, in the parish of Aberchirder, and came under the discipline of the Strathbogie presbytery, on account of her being a Papist. So early as 1636, the synod had sent one of their number to deal with her, and induce her to go to church: for a time she conformed. Two years after, a similar visitation of the lady had become necessary; so she and her daughter Elizabeth were summoned, for 'not hearing of the word, and not communicating.' What came of this does not appear; but, in 1643, a deputation of ministers was sent to deal with her according to the ordinance of the General Assembly, and to report her answer. It was soon after reported that 'she promised to hear the word, and desired a time for further resolution.' It was then agreed to give her some short space to decide on becoming 'a daily hearer;' but 'if she refused, the process to go on against her.' The poor lady once more promised 'to hear the word, as she had done before,' and it was resolved to ask the advice of the General Assembly on the point. Years passed on, without bringing her further than to agree to go to the church which her husband frequented,—which was out of the bounds of this presbytery.

What immediately happened after this, does not appear; but, on the presbytery resolving (January, 1647) again to proceed against her ladyship, it was reported that she was out of the country. A few months later, the Commissioners of the General Assembly 'granted her liberty to be ane ordinar hearer of the word, at Forgue for a time.' This, however, did not stop the process. The lady was hunted into another presbytery, where she seems to have kept them at bay for a little while. In June, 1648, Mr. John Reidford reported that he had spoken to her, but 'found no effect of his travels;' he required further time. Soon after, the same minister reported that on a second interview she expressed herself as 'willing to hear the word in any kirk save Aberchirder, and such as are within the presbytery of Strathbogie.' This was not to be endured. She was immediately summoned as a contumacious person. On the day of call, 'she compeared not;' and Mr. John Reidford, her parish minister, proceeded to give from his pulpit, on successive Sundays, a series of three admonitions addressed to her; then, in like manner, a series of three prayers. As her ladyship continued to disregard all proceedings in her case, the presbytery prepared itself to pass the awful doom of excommunication, when, behold! another act of concession on her part stays all: she agrees to be present at family worship in her own house,—her husband was all this time a leading Covenanter,—and promises also to hear a sermon; whereupon the sentence was suspended for a time. In August, 1649, the minister, Reidford, reported that she had 'keepit sermon at Innerkeithing the last Lord's day, and daily keepit family worship.' This was not enough. They instruct Reidford 'to show her that, if she did not conform in all points, the sentence of excommunication would be pronounced before the next assembly.' Reidford soon after pleaded for her, that she had heard three sermons; but the brethren 'thought not that kind of hearing satisfactory.' They ordained him to put her to a decided test at once, by offering her the Covenant: failing her subscribing that, Reidford was to pronounce sentence.

The lady, with the ingenuity of her sex, contrived once more to put them off: she told Reidford she would take a thought about it. Meanwhile, she amused them with hopes by continuing to attend church; telling them 'she was not fully satisfied for subscribing the Covenant.' But even female wit could not hold out for ever against such a siege. In June, 1650, after incessant plying for fourteen years, she gave them 'satisfaction' by subscribing the Covenant, and thus abjuring in words the faith she

still held in her heart. Little more than two years had elapsed, when the presbytery learned that she had 'relapsed to Popery,' and appointed commissioners to confer with her on the subject. It was found she was now obstinate in her original belief, 'professing, moreover, that she repented of her former repentance more than of any sin she ever committed,' and thought that she had reason to repent all her life-time for subscribing the National Covenant and Solemn League and Covenant. Then took place a renewal of the same tedious dealings with the lady, ending at last, in 1654, in a peremptory order for her excommunication. By that time, however, excommunication had lost much of its terrors, as Cromwell, then master of Scotland, would not allow the sentence to have any consequence in respect of civil rights.

But the clergy did not carry matters with so high a hand, even during the time of the Covenant, without exciting the indignant remonstrances of the rough materials they had to deal with, which were vented both in acts of contumacy and in expressions of contempt. For instance, John Tulloch, on being summoned regarding an irregularity with Elizabeth Gordon, answered, 'The devil a care cared he for their excommunication; excommunicate him to the morn, (to-morrow,) if they pleased.' Three witnesses attested regarding James Middleton, that, on his being rebuked by the minister, they heard him say that 'he cared not for him, nor any minister in Scotland;' and when the minister threatened to put him in the *jongs*, they heard him say that 'neither he nor the best minister within seven miles durst do so much.' A better specimen of a recusant than these, — seeing he assigned reasonable grounds for his recusancy, — was one William Gordon, in Dumbennan parish, who declined (June, 1652) the authority of the presbytery, in consideration of the many sad experiences he had had of the usurpation of civil power by the Presbyterian government, and its 'tyrannous persecuting of men's consciences, who, out of tender scruples, did differ from their opinions in matters indifferent and circumstantial; as also, finding that the greatest part of their prayer and preaching doth more tender the advancement of their private interest and faction than the propagation of the Gospel; and seeing their frequent railing against the authority and civil power which God hath set over us, whereby the people's minds are kept unsettled and averse from the cordial union of both nations, which, by God's great mercy, we are now like to enjoy.' He declared himself separate from them, and that he would 'no more esteem of their excommunication than they did formerly of the Pope.' On sentence

of excommunication being passed on this recusant, 'he lookit very frowardly, and uttered himself most proudly and maliciously.'

We have no disposition to disparage a period and a race of ministers distinguished by many precious virtues; but in faithfulness to the great Gospel principle that the power of the Spirit, and not the secular arm, is the true agent for the spread of evangelical truth, we must add a few words as to the state of the clergy themselves, whose irreligious intolerance was naturally combined with harsh and unchristian manners. Thus we find the Commissioners of the General Assembly denouncing 'the enormities and corruptions observed to be in the ministry,' and making out a list which is difficult to reconcile with our ideas of the boasted golden age of the Scottish Presbyterian polity. There is 'much fruitless conversing in company,' 'great worldliness,' 'sighting of God's worship in families,' 'want of gravity in carriage and apparel,' 'tippling and bearing company in untimorous drinking in taverns,' 'discountenancing of the godly,' even a want of decent observance of the Sabbath. 'There are also to be found amongst us (some) who use small and minced oaths.' It must be remembered that these passages are all taken from the Records of the Kirk of Scotland.

Throughout the whole period covered by these volumes, we perceive a perfect passion of the Scots for hunting out and punishing witches and warlocks. No doubt during the same period too numerous instances of the kind are to be met with in the annals of England and every other country in Europe; but we imagine that the taste for this sport never in any other country arose to such a pitch as it did in Scotland. The very earnestness of religious belief which characterized the people, became a source of additional cruelty, when set in motion by ignorance and superstition. We shall give a few illustrations, all occurring within a brief period, and here recorded within the compass of a few pages. We shall thus enable our readers who may be familiar with the English mode of procedure in such cases, to compare it with the practice of the neighbouring country. A close family likeness will be discovered, and yet some characteristic differences will be observed.

On the 30th of October, 1628, the Earl of Monteith, Lord Justice-General of the kingdom, reported to the Privy Council the case of Janet Boyd, spouse to Robert Neill, burgess of Dumbarton, who had freely confessed that she had entered into

covenant with the devil, had received his mark, had renounced her baptism, and been much too intimate with the above personage, through whose power she laid diseases upon sundry persons. The Council approved of a commission for trying Janet, and for 'the punishing of so foul and detestable a crime.'

In the course of 1629, Isabel Young, spouse to George Smith, portioner in East Barns in Haddingtonshire, was burnt for witchcraft. She had been accused of both inflicting and curing diseases; indeed, some of these poor creatures, like modern homœopaths, professed to be able to do either with the same thing. It appears that she and her husband had sent to the Laird of Lee to borrow his *curing-stone* for their cattle, which had 'the routing ill.' This is interesting as an early reference to the well-known Lee Penny, which is yet preserved in the family of Lockhart of Lee, being an ancient precious stone or amulet, set in a silver penny. It is related that Lady Lee declined to lend the stone, but gave flagons of water in which the penny had been steeped. This water, being drunk by the cattle, was believed to have effected their cure.

One Alexander Hamilton was apprehended as a notorious warlock, and put into the Tolbooth of Edinburgh, where was also in captivity the Lady Abercorn, whose offence was not less metaphysical than his own. He 'delated' four women of the burgh of Haddington, and five other women of his neighbourhood, as guilty of witchcraft. The Privy Council sent orders (November, 1692) to have the whole Circean nine apprehended; and as their poverty made it inconvenient to bring them to Edinburgh, the presbytery of Haddington was enjoined to examine them in their own district. What was done with them ultimately, we are not informed. Another woman, Catherine Oswald, residing at Middry, near Edinburgh, was likewise accused by Hamilton, and taken into custody. This seems to have been considered an unusually important case, as four lawyers were appointed to act as assessors to the Justices on her trial. It was alleged of Catherine that she had that partial insensibility which was understood to be an undoubted proof of the witch quality. Two witnesses stated that they 'saw an preen (pin) put in to the heid, by Mr. John Aird, minister, in the panel's shoulder, being the devil's mark, and nae bluid following, nor she naeways shrinking thereat.' Hamilton alleged that he had been with Catherine at a meeting of witches between Niddry and Edmondstone, where they met with the devil. It was also stated that she had been one of a witch-party who had met at Prestonpans, and used charms, on the night of the great storm

at the end of March, 1625. But the chief articles of her dittay bore reference to cures which she had wrought by sorcery. Catherine was convicted and burned.

In November, the Privy Council issued a Commission to the Bishop of Dumblane for the examination of John Hog and Margaret Nicholson, his spouse, 'upon their guiltiness of the crime of witchcraft, with power to confront them with others who best can give evidence.' This pair were soon after brought to the Edinburgh prison, whence, however, they were speedily released, on caution for re-appearance. The Lords, on the same day, issued a charge against 'Margaret Maxwell, spouse to Nicol Thompson, and Jean Thompson, her daughter, spouse to umwhile Edward Hamilton, in Dumfries,' who, it was said, had procured the death of the said Edward, 'by the devilish and detestable practice of witchcraft.' Claud Hamilton, of Mauchlinehole, brother of the deceased Edward, soon after (December 22nd, 1629) presented a petition to the Privy Council, claiming that they should order an examination of Geillie Duncan, of Dumfries, now in hands there, on suspicion of a concern in the fact. The Council, accordingly, commissioned the magistrates and ministers of Dumfries to effect this examination.

The warlock Alexander Hamilton also accused the Lady Home of Manderston, in Berwickshire, of having practised against the life of her husband by witchcraft. Patrick Abernethy, notary in Dunse, and William Mowat, a servant, were accordingly cited by the Council to come and give information regarding the case. The presence of Sir George himself was of course desirable: but Sir George, like many other good Scotch lairds of that day, and of later days, was under some danger of the law on account of his debts. It therefore became necessary to send him a protection, in order that he might be enabled to appear in the city. There does not seem to have been any other foundation for this charge than the fact that Sir George Home and his wife did not live on amicable terms. Some months after (June 29th, 1630) we find Sir George giving caution that he will not molest his wife or any of her tenants, 'in their bodies, lands, rooms, possessions, corns, cattle, guids, or geir, otherwise nor by order of law.'

Hamilton himself was tried, (January 22nd, 1630,) when it came out that he had begun his wicked career in consequence of meeting the devil in the form of a black man on Kingston Hills, in Haddingtonshire. Being engaged to serve the fiend, he was instructed to raise him by beating the ground thrice with a fir-stick, and crying, 'Rise up, foul thief!' He had, consequently, had him up several times for consultations; sometimes in the

shape of a cat or dog, sometimes in that of a crow. By diabolic aid, he had caused a mill full of corn, belonging to Provost Cockburn, to be burned, merely by taking three stalks from the provost's stacks, and burning them on the Garleton Hills. He had been at many witch-meetings, where the enemy of man was present. This wretched man was sentenced to be worried at a stake, and burned.

On the 3rd of July, 1630, the Council took order in the case of Alie Nisbet, midwife, of Hilton (apparently in Berwickshire), and also in that of John Neill, John Smith, and Catherine Wilson, 'concerning their practice of witchcraft.' Nisbet was accused of curing a woman by taking a pail with hot water, and bathing the patient's legs. This may appear as a very natural and proper kind of treatment; but there was an addition: she put her fingers into the water, and ran three times round the bed *widdershins*, or contrary to the direction of the sun, crying, 'The bones to the fire, and the soul to the devil!' thereby putting the disease upon another woman, who died in twenty-four hours. Nisbet, also, had put some enchanted water under a threshold, for the injury of a servant girl against whom she had a spite, and who, passing over it, was bewitched, and died instantly. She was 'worried and burnt.'

We have a few interesting glimpses of the illustrious John Knox, already advanced in years, at the period of the earliest of these records. At the age of fifty-eight he entered into the state of wedlock for the second time, by marrying Margaret Stewart, daughter of Lord Ochiltree. She proved a good wife to the old man, and survived him. Mr. Chambers observes that the circumstance of a young woman of rank, with royal blood in her veins,—for such was the case,—accepting an elderly husband so far below her degree, did not fail to excite remark; and John's Papist enemies could not account for it otherwise than by a supposition of the black art having been employed. The affair is thus adverted to by the Reformer's shameless enemy, Nicol Burne:—

'A little after he did pursue to have alliance with the honourable house of Ochiltree, of the king's majesty's own bluid. Riding there with ane great court (*cortége*), on ane trim gelding, nocht like ane prophet or ane auld decrepit priest, as he was, but like as he had been ane of the bluid royal, with his bands of taffeta fastenit with golden rings and precious stanes; and, as is plainly reported in the country, by sorcery and witecraft, (he) did sae allure that puir gentlewoman, that she could not live without him; whilk appears to be of great probability, she being ane damsel of noble bluid, and he ane auld

decrepit creature of maist base degree, sae that sic ane noble house could not have degenerated sae far, except John Knox had interposed the power of his master the devil, wha, as he transfigures himself sometimes as ane angel of licht, sae he caused John Knox appear ane of the maist noble and lusty men that could be found in the world.'

A few years later, we learn from James Melville some particulars of his declining days. While Melville was at the University of St. Andrew's, where Knox then resided, he states that the venerable divine was used to come into the College yard, call the scholars to where he reposed, and, after giving them excellent advice as to their studies and conduct, exhort them to carry on the work of God in their country, and conclude by solemnly giving them his blessing. Of one of his last efforts in the pulpit, he states :—

'I saw him every day of his doctrine go'hooley and fair (softly and fairly) with a furring of mutricks about his neck, a staff in ane hand, and guid godly Richard Ballanden, his servant, halding up the other oxter, (armpit,) from the abbey to the parish kirk, and by the said Richard and another servant lifted up to the pulpit; whar he behovit to lean at his first entry, but ere he had done with his sermon, he was sae active and vigorous, that he was like to ding that pulpit in blads, (knock the pulpit in splinters,) and flie out of it.'

When John Knox was on his death-bed in Edinburgh, November, 1572, a remarkable circumstance occurred. At that time, the well-known Kirkaldy, of Grange, on behalf of the Catholic party, was holding out the Castle of Edinburgh against the Regent Morton, aided by a small army from England. Secretary Maitland, of Lethington, was his principal companion and adviser. Mr. David Lindsay, minister of Leith, came to visit the Reformer one morning, and asked how he did.

'He answerit: "Weel, brother, I thank God; I have desired all this day to have you, that I may send you yet to yon man in the castle, whom ye ken I have loved sae dearly. Go, I pray you, tell him that I have sent you to him yet ance, to warn and bid him, in the name of God, leave that evil cause, and give ower that castle: gif not, he shall be brought down ower the walls with shame, and hing against the sun: sae God has assured me." Mr. David, howbeit he thought the message hard, and the threatening over particular, yet obeyed, and passed to the castle; and meeting with Sir Robert Melville, walking on the wall, tauld him, wha was, as he thought, meikle movit with the matter. Thereafter (he) communed with the captain, whom he thought also somewhat moved; but he passed from him into the Secretar Lethington, with whom when he had conferred a while, he came out to Mr. David again, and said to him: "Go, tell Mr. Knox he is but ane.....prophet." Mr. David, returning, tauld

Mr. Knox he had discharged the commission faithfully, but that it was not weel accepted of after the captain had conferrit with the secretary. "Weel, (says Mr. Knox,) I have been earnest with my God anent the twa men: for the ane, (Kirkaldy,) I am sorry that so should befall him; yet God assures me there is mercy for his saul: for that other, (the Secretary Lethington,) I have nae warrant that ever he shall be weel."

The castle surrendered, and Kirkaldy fell into the power of the Regent Morton. He offered all he possessed for his life. But the Reformer's prophecy was to be fulfilled; and how far it served to fulfil itself we may surmise, from what Morton wrote to the English agent. 'Considering,' he says, 'what has been, and daily is, *spoken by the preachers, that God's plague will not cease while the land be purged of blood*, and having regard that such as are interested by the death of their friends, the destruction of their houses, and away taking of their goods, could not be satisfied by any offer made to me in particular..... I deliberated to let justice proceed.'

Mr. David Lindsay, who had gone with Kirkaldy's fruitless offer,

'the morn by nine hours comes again to the captain, the laird of Grange (who was now confined under a guard in a house in the High Street), and, taking him to a fore-stair of the lodging apart, resolves him it behoved him to suffer. "O then, Mr. David, (says he,) for our auld friendship, and for Christ's sake, leave me not." So he remains with him, wha, passing up and down a while, came to a shot (a hole fitted with a sliding panel in the wooden front of the house), and, seeing the day fair, the sun clear, and a scaffold preparing at the Cross, he falls in a great study (reverie), and alters countenance and colour; whilk, when Mr. David perceived, he came to him and asked what he was doing. "Faith, Mr. David, (says he,) I perceive weel now that Mr. Knox was the true servant of God, and his threatening is to be accomplished." Lindsay mentioned the assurance which Knox had had regarding the ultimate salvation of the unfortunate man; which gave him much comfort and renewed courage; 'sae that he dined moderately, and thereafter took Mr. David apart for his strengthening to suffer that death, and in (the) end beseeks him not to leave him, but to convoy him to the place of execution. "And take heed (says he,) I hope in God, after I shall be thought past, to give you a taiken of the assurance of that mercy to my saul, according to the speaking of that man of God."

'Sae, about three hours afternoon, he was brought out, and Mr. David with him; and, about four, the sun being wast about the northward nook of the steeple, he was put aff the ladder, and his face first fell to the east, but within a little while, turned about to the west, and there remained against the sun; at whilk time, Mr. David, ever present, says he marked him, when all thought he was away (dead),

to lift up his hands that were bund before him, and lay them down again safely; whilk moved him with exclamation to glorify God before all the people.'

The above account is derived from James Melville. This chronicler gives some pleasing touches of his uncle's character. Andrew Melville was Principal of the Theological College (St. Mary's) at St. Andrew's; deeply learned, logical, not arrogant for himself, but possessed of all that disinterestedness and integrity which form the peculiar glory of Knox's character; to crown all, strenuous and fearless in the advocacy of his views of religion and Church discipline. James describes him as remarkable for patience and equal temper, where others were hot. Yet

'this I ever remarked to be Mr. Andrew's manner: Being sure of a truth in reasoning, he wald be extreme hot, and suffer nae man to bear away the contrair, but with reason, words, and gesture, he wald carry it away, caring for nae person, how great soever they were, namely, in matters of religion. And in all companies at table and otherways, as he understood and took up the necessity of the persons and matter in hand to require, he wald *freely and bauldly hald their ears fu' of the truth*; and, take it as they wald, he wald not cease nor keep silence; yea, and not only anes or twice, but at all occasions, till he fand them better instructed, and set to go forward in the good purpose.'

His 'heroic courage and stoutness' in advancing his own views, and resisting persons of authority set upon establishing what he thought error, were equally remarkable. By word as well as by deed, he knew how to answer and defeat the Regent Morton, and stubbornly repelled both his arguments and bribes. Other curious particulars and traits occur in the course of these volumes, which we commend to those who feel an interest in the subject.

ART. IX.—*Passages from the Diary of General Patrick Gordon of Auchleuchries.* A.D. 1635–1699. 4to. Printed for the Spalding Club. 1859.

It is well known that the Czar Peter I. of Russia derived that strong bias in favour of foreign institutions which made him the greatest Revolutionist of his time, from the influence of foreigners who resided at the court of his father and brothers. Next to Lefort the Swiss, in degree of familiar friendship with the young prince, stood Patrick Gordon, whose career is vividly set before us in a volume recently issued by the Spalding Society. The perusal of this book carries us into the regions of romance; for here we see set down with scrupulous regularity incidents and details of real life for which hitherto we have had no higher authority than the highly coloured narration of the immortal Rittmaster, Dugald Dalgetty.

The origin of the publication is not the least curious part of the story before us. This soldier of fortune, Patrick Gordon, though he started in life as a simple trooper, following the Swedish banner, died full of honours and dignities,—General—Commander-in-Chief—Field Marshal in the Russian service. Throughout his busy life he had persevered in doing what so many of us have done, fortunately doubtless for our survivors, by fits and starts,—he kept a diary. So conscientious was he in the discharge of this tedious duty, that at his death there were found eight or ten thick quarto volumes, recording the incidents of his life from 1635 to 1699. With the dispersion and ultimate extinction of his family the volumes were scattered abroad, and not until several years had elapsed were six of them re-united in the archives of the Foreign Office at Moscow. The Diary for the seventeen years between 1667 and 1684 has not been recovered, with the exception of one volume, which includes the year 1677–78. Russian and Russo-German writers made use of the Gordon MSS. freely in their accounts of Peter and Peter's campaigns; and in 1849–51 Dr. Posselt published at Moscow a well-edited German translation of nearly the whole Diary. It was in reviewing this translation for the *Quarterly Review*, that the late Earl of Ellesmere expressed in a genial way a hope that one of the Scotch printing clubs, or all of them joined together, would procure and print a copy of the Diary in its original language. The volume now before us is the result of this—in a literary sense—true Fortunatus's wish. It so happened that the then Prime Minister of England was the head of the house of which Patrick Gordon had been a cadet. The Earl of Aberdeen moreover stood to the Czar Nicolas in the relation of a 'friend of

forty years.' He was also President of the Spalding Club, which had been referred to by name in the article in the *Quarterly*. He made an application to the Court of St. Petersburg for a transcript of all the passages of General Gordon's Diary which related to his native country. The request was granted with prompt and liberal courtesy. We cannot help wishing that the request had been enlarged, and that a transcript of the whole Diary as it stands had been placed at the disposal of the printing clubs of Scotland. We should not perhaps have had so readable a book from the Spalding; but that matters little. Valuable materials for history would have been placed securely in this country which are now beyond our reach. We have always considered that the beneficial object for which printing clubs were instituted, was mainly to print such volumes as would be too ponderous or of too limited a sale for a private publisher to undertake. Let them amass the genuine materials of fact and illustration, however unattractive may be the form in which they may be presented. Abundance of skilled writers will be found to make agreeable books out of promising matter, and all the publishers in England are waiting for really good and pleasant books with which to catch the favour of the public.

We would not, however, seem to be ungrateful to the Spalding Club, but proceed with interested thankfulness to examine the contents of the volume they have printed, and to exhibit to our readers something of the career of a genuine soldier of fortune.

Patrick Gordon was born, as he says, 'in the year of our redemption 1635, on the last day of March, about three o'clock afternoon, being Easter,' in Auchlichries,* Aberdeenshire, and was the second son of John Gordon and Mary Ogilvie, both Roman Catholics. His father, the laird of the place, was himself a cadet of that younger branch of the house of Gordon which was represented by Sir John Gordon, of Haddo, the determined royalist who distinguished himself at the battle of Turreff, and whose defence of the house of Kellie against the Covenanters, in 1643, was punished first by imprisonment in a church in Edinburgh, since known as *Haddo's hole*, and then by death upon the scaffold. Sir John's son George was the first Earl of Aberdeen. The boy Patrick and his brother were excluded by their profession of the Roman Catholic faith from the best means of obtaining a liberal education. They were sent to various schools; and in the first, which he entered in his fifth and quitted in his ninth year, they had reached, says the diarist, '*Multiplex uno sensu dicatur abundans*, in the first part of Despaunter's Gram-

* The name is written in the original Diary this way, and on the title-page of the book, as given above.

mar.' His schooling was continued by various hands until 1651, when, in his sixteenth year, he was kept at home and 'did wait upon his father. He seems not to have been happy in this kind of life, since, to use his own words, 'I resolved, partly to dissolve the bonds of a youthful affection, wherein I was entangled, by banishing myself from the object; partly to obtain my liberty, which I fondly conceived to be restrained by the careful inspection of my loving parents; but most of all, my patrimony being but small, as being the younger son of the younger brother of a younger house; I resolved, I say, to go to some foraigne country, not caring much on what pretence or to which country I should go, seeing I had no known friend in any foraigne place.'

The little dash of love in a youth of sixteen is no inappropriate commencement of the story of an adventurer's life. He must have reached a mature age when he began to write his Diary; for there is no tone in it of enthusiasm or lofty aspiration or even of amazement excited by the new scenes and circumstances into which he was thrown. He is as canny and prosaic as a Scotchman can be. The gentle touch of nature, however, comes in at 'the sadd parting with my loveing mother, brothers, and sisters.' The loving mother followed him to Aberdeen four days later, to give him her last benediction. The ship on which he made his start in life was bound for Dantzic, and met with no incident worthy of Gordon's journal, save that it was challenged one night by some Hollanders, who 'asked if wee had any Parliament men aboard? and if wee had seen an English shipp that had escaped them in the mist?' To both which was answered, 'No.' Contrary winds drove the ship close to the coast of Norway, the aspect of whose rugged sides elicits no remark or description from the diarist. After passing the island of Anholt in the Categat, at a rock 'called the Kole, the skippers exact a discretion of every one who hath not passed that way before. The mariners are ordinarily lett downe thrice into the sea.' It was June, 1651, when the boy left home, and in the dreary neighbourhood of the Frische Haff, after much walking, hunger, and weariness, but without any recorded adventures, he found a refuge in a college of Jesuits at Braunsberg. Here he remained two years, pursuing his studies, which did not include, it would seem, the language of the country, and ending in the discovery that his humour could not endure such a still and strict way of living. Accordingly, having resolved to return home again, on a Tuesday in 1653, about ten o'clock, he set out on foot, to save expenses, with seven dollars and a half of money, and one suit of clothes, which he had on. 'So taking my cloake and a little bagge wherein were my linnens and some bookes, with a

staff in hand, I pilgrim'd it away all alone.' The spirit of the Scottish laird was not dead within him, to wit: 'My portmantell I caryed for ease on my back, betwixt villages, or when I did see nobody; but coming to any village, or meeting any body, I took it under my arme.' There is a way of carrying a bag or a parcel with dignity. His clandestine departure from the college prevented his revisiting Father Blackhall, a Scotch priest at Frauensberg, who had befriended him, and strongly persuaded him to become 'a religious.' Cast upon his own resources, his prospects were gloomy. He could not travel with comfort or profit, from his ignorance of the language, which he calls 'the Dutch,' (Deutsch,) and the lowness of his funds.

His seven dollars and a half must soon be exhausted, 'and when that was gone I knew not where to gett a farthing more for the great jorney and voyage which I intended. To serve or work, I thought it a disparagement; and to begg, a greater. I grew so pensive and sadd, that sitting down, I began to lament and bewaile my miserable condition. Then having my recourse to God Almighty, I with many teares implored his assistance, craving also the intercession of the blessed Virgin and all the Saints in heaven.' He is comforted by the appearance of a venerable old man, riding across his path in the gloomy fir forest he was traversing. The old man, seeing him in tears, spoke kindly to him words which Gordon understood to mean, 'Cry not, my child; God will comfort you.' To the young man's excited mind, this 'suddaine appearance' seemed a special interposition of Providence, and gave him heart to walk on more cheerfully. In his further progress to Dantzic, he meets with various companions and fellow-travellers; among others a Scotch pedlar, one of a numerous fraternity then flourishing in Germany, who strove in vain to persuade the fugitive from Jesuit professors to become a hawker too.

In Dantzic a similar attempt to the pedlar's was made on his pride of gentleman, by some merchants and fellow-countrymen lodging in the house where he stayed. But though he felt their kindness, and he had reached nearly, if not quite, to the bottom of his pocket, his repugnance to trade was unconquerable. He could not get away to Scotland, the ships being all gone when he arrived in Dantzic. Nine or ten months must elapse before another opportunity of sailing from Dantzic to Scotland would occur. What was he to do? By the advice of the friendly merchants, who perhaps liked the youth and his cavalier notions, he started on a 'longsome and irksome' voyage up the Vistula in a flat-bottomed boat going to *Swets*, in order to find out a namesake residing at Culm. 'I had very little pleasure for the

most part of the way; the Vistula being hemmed and kept in with great dammes on either side, which hinder the prospect of the country. My best pastime was my booke.' He does not say what book it was; probably the *Thomas à Kempis* which was taken from him in a subsequent adventure. The only notes he makes of the towns on the way refer to their fortifications, and plainly indicate his inclination towards the profession of arms. At Culm he passed the winter of 1653-4. How he was engaged is not recorded; but at the end of that time he was persuaded by one John Dick, 'prentice to a merchant,' to travel with him further into Poland, where he might gratify his taste for soldiering, as Duke Ian Radzivill had a life company 'all 'or most Scottismen.' On reaching Warsaw they found that Duke Radzivill had not come to the 'Seym or Parliament,' and the hopes built on the chance of enlisting in his Scotch company were annihilated. John Dick could speak 'Polls and Dutch,' and soon contrived to make a living by merchandise; but our hero was in greater straits than ever, and once more turned his thoughts and his steps homeward. Inquiring for the nearest way to Scotland, he was told that Posen was the place he should first go to; and an occasion offered of getting there free of expense, by accompanying a gentleman on his return from the 'Seim,' who needed assistance in the management of some horses he had bought. Honest Patrick's love for horsecflesh probably made him see less indignity in the occupation of a groom than in the gross mechanical business of a trader. He does not fail, however, to say, 'When wee came to any towne, he would have me lead one and the servant the other two spare horses.' At other times they drove the horses along. At Posen the laird's son dined with the member of the Polish Parliament, at his house in the Jews' street, and thus satisfactorily vindicated himself from the suspicion of having been engaged as a menial. After this, the two went together to a Scotsman, James Lindesay, who was 'imperiously inquisitive,' and whom Gordon answered with an 'observant ingenuity,'—a euphuism which recalls the saying of Mademoiselle Montpensier, that 'she never told lies, but supplied by the exercise of her imagination the defects of her memory.' Gordon's condition must have been pretty low, when his proud stomach could digest Lindesay's sneer at his parents' names: 'Gordon and Ogilvie! these are two great clans; sure you must be a gentleman!' To which he answered, 'albeit he knew it to be spoken in derision, he hoped he was not the worse for that.' Lindesay and other countrymen in Posen proved kind friends, and by their recommendation, and with their aid in his outfit, he was made one of the suite of a

young nobleman, Oppalinsky, going on his travels. At Hamburg, in the month of February, 1655, he quitted this gentleman's service; and now came the turning-point of his fortunes. His entrance upon a military career seems at last to have been decided by an accident. He was waiting for an opportunity of sailing to Scotland, and, for the sake of economy, living in the most retired manner possible. It was at the time when the Swedish officers were in the town levying and enlisting soldiers. All the inns were full of cavaliers 'ranting and carousing.' At meal-times Gordon could not absolutely avoid a cornet and a quartermaster, who lodged in the same house. They plied the usual arts of the recruiting sergeant, 'extolled a soldier's life, telling that riches and honour, and all sorts of worldly blessings, lay prostrate at a soldier's feet, wanting only his will to stoop and take them up;' then, assailing Patrick's weakest point, they waxed eloquent 'in commendation of our countrymen, than whom no better soldiers were of any nation to be found; and albeit nature had endued them with a genius fit for anything, yet did they despise the ease, advantage, or contentment any other trade might bring, and embraced that of a soldier, which, without all dispute, is the most honorable.'

This last thrust went home, doubtless, to the young man's heart, and it hardly needed an introduction to Rittmaster Gardin, who had a brother, 'the major,' 'that must have been a kinsman to the Gordons!' to make an easy conquest of the promising recruit. Under the influence of sundry glasses of wine, in memory of friends in Scotland, general and particular, by which Patrick and other guests of the Rittmaster were 'pretty well warmed,' the resolution to return to Auchleuchries was soon battered down. They said, 'I would be laughed at when I should come home, where they would tell me I had been over sea to see what o'clock it was, and returned as wise as I went out.' Another strong argument with a hereditary royalist and hater of the solemn League and Covenant, was the hint that the country was 'enthralled by an imperious insulting enemy.' He joined Gardin's troop. The intemperance which his new kind of life forced on him, spite of his natural aversion to it, brought on a fever and an ague, which made his first experience of a march bitter indeed. When he grew quite incapable of riding a horse, he lay on an open waggon above the Rittmaster's baggage, 'and was very glad of such a convenience.' The war in which our free lance was about to engage was an enterprise undertaken by Charles Gustavus of Sweden, mainly for the purpose of trying his martial skill, and practising the lessons he had learnt under the great General Torstenson.

With the history of the war we have nothing to do. The incidents recorded by Gordon show the Swedish commanders to have been monsters of ferocity. After a year's service under them, the young Scotsman was captured by the Poles, and recovered his liberty only on condition of enlisting in the army of his recent antagonists. He was not over scrupulous on the point of changing his colours, so long as he could adhere to the soldado's code of honour,—the observance of his engagement for the term paid for. He was clever, too, in turning an honest penny by protecting the country people and their herds from the foragers,—for a consideration. To other attractions he was coldly insensible. The dark eyes of a Polish girl, who sang love songs to him, and gave him pretty lessons in the Polish language, shed their lustre in vain, though her mother was willing to have him for a son-in-law.

By the fortune of war he was again transferred a prisoner to the hands of the Swedes, who seem to have accepted his services again as easily as they would have used a young war-horse taken from the Polish camp. The monarchs of the time were not behind the Scottish mercenary in the capriciousness with which they gave or withheld their support from their neighbours. Poland, which then showed symptoms of that 'sickness' which a century later ended in death, was then being attacked by two powers, the Swedes and the Russians. Czar Alexis, however, fearing that, by assisting to ruin Poland, he might be giving to Sweden an inconvenient accession of strength, turned his arms against the Swedish city of Riga, which he probably would have taken, had not his Scotch officers, Leslie and others, refrained from doing an unkind turn to a King who was a great patron of Scottish cavaliers, and who might ere long possibly offer good pay for their own swords.

The *Diary* instructively shows the rapid progress of a soldier's education. As a forager, none so daring or successful as our hero; he puts money in his purse on every available opportunity. Yet he can be gallant and disinterested. He rescues a lady from certain rude Finlanders, restores her to a relative, supplies her rifled wardrobe from some booty of his own, and refuses the recompence tendered by the grateful friends. In 1658 he coolly attempts, in conjunction with fifteen others, the assassination of Cromwell's ambassador to Muscovy passing that way, because, his name being Bradshawe, they took him for the famous President of the 'Highest Court of Injustice.' The crime was prevented by the arrival of a Swedish guard. Again prisoner with the Poles, Gordon, grown more punctilious on points of service, hesitated long before yielding to the pressing offers

of employment from his captors. He resisted the blandishments of the renowned John Sobieski, who, though courteous, was, he says, 'a hard bargainer.' But at length, in 1659, he accepted the appointment of quartermaster, vindicating his change of standard by the consideration that he wanted to make his fortune, whereas in the Swedish army the soldier was in danger of dying of starvation. He may have remembered, too, that his late colonel had a short time before threatened to blow his brains out; and that the royal hands of Charles Gustavus himself had inflicted hard and shameful blows on the head and shoulders of Meldrum, the Scottish Rittmaster of Gordon's company. The Polish service seems to have had one sore temptation in exposing our cautious Patrick to the soft impeachments of love. Twice he was assailed with eligible offers, both of which he firmly, but, no doubt, gently, declined.

On hearing of King Charles's restoration, in 1660, the loyal enthusiasm of Gordon expressed itself in the, to him, unusual way of drinking too much. He was, withal, eager to return home, and enter His Majesty's service, but was spared the disappointment that fell on so many loyal adherents of the Stuarts, by the inducements held out to him by Field-Marshal Lubomirski, under whom he fought in the terrible battle of Czudno, where the Russians were defeated with great slaughter by the Poles and Crim-Tartars. Curious details occur in this part of the Diary, relating to the prisoners, the Polish army, the Diet at Warsaw, and other matters of interest to the historian. Gordon soon contrived to get himself into a position sufficiently perplexing, by his over-cunning. With a view to employment at home under King Charles, he had given notice to Lubomirski of his intention to quit the Polish service. A letter from his father convinces him that in Great Britain there is no prospect of success in a military career, and that he had better push his fortunes still on the Continent. Ashamed to confess his disappointment to his Polish commander, he jumps at an offer made by the ambassador from Vienna, to employ him and three other officers in raising a troop of horse for the Emperor's service. On the strength of this engagement he has taken final leave of his old commander, and resigned his post of quartermaster, when orders came from the Kaiser *not* to raise the troop of horse. Gordon, who thought he had laid his plans so well by having two strings to his bow while it was necessary, is deeply mortified at finding himself deprived of both the appointments of which he had but just had the free choice. He claimed compensation from the imperial ambassador, and with so much success that arrangements were made for sending him to Vienna

with almost the promise of an engagement in the Emperor's army. Though he had agreed to the conditions, Gordon felt the uncertainty of the prospect before him so keenly, that he turned a willing ear to the Russian ambassador, and a fellow-countryman, Colonel Crawford, who prevailed on him to take service under the Czar. His intercourse with the prisoners taken at Czudno, many of them Scots, had greatly facilitated this negotiation. He began his Russian career with an act of duplicity that must have won the admiration of his Muscovite friends. Not liking to face the German ambassador with an acknowledgment of his engagement with the Russian, he inquired when the dispatches that he was to take to Vienna would be ready. 'In eight days,' was the answer. Pretending that all his best things lay at Thorn, thirty miles from Warsaw, he obtained leave to go and fetch them, on his promising not to fail in his return at the appointed time. He at once prepared for his departure with the Russians to their country, leaving two letters with a trusty comrade, dated from Thorn, and addressed to the imperial ambassador, one three days before the time stipulated for his return, the other a fortnight later, describing a violent attack of fever from which he said he was suffering, and his slow progress towards health, and concluding with expressions of his deep regret at not being able to fulfil his engagements. Truly there were the elements of a great diplomatist in this man!

There is no attempt in the Diary to conceal the thoroughly mercenary character of the engagements which the writer made, and no one who has travelled into Russia by the miserably dreary route of Poland and Livonia can wonder at the new recruit finding his courage for this new undertaking ooze rapidly away. On reaching Riga, he had already determined to see his quondam prisoners, Colonel Crawford and party, in a place of safety, and return to the scenes of his previous career, when he met two old comrades, Scotchmen, of the Swedish army, who in the most woe-begone manner bewailed their hard lot, and the sad tendency that seemed to prevail in Europe towards a general peace. Instead of encouraging him, as he had expected, to turn his back on Russia, with its black dirty border towns and their squalid inhabitants, they seemed to envy his good luck; for the Czar, they had heard, did duly pay his foreign officers their stipends, however small these might be, which was more than could be said for the Swedish monarch, from whose service they two were discharged. The matter ended in Gordon's enlisting his two friends as officers for the Czar's army. The fair show of things, however, which was presented to the fancy of these adventurers, led them through much disappointment and disgust

to but a tardy success. Like the cities which Gordon saw on his way, with their gay church towers and gilded or star-bespangled cupolas, that rose above the plain, presenting 'glorious show afarr off;' but which 'stunk with nastiness' when they were entered, the hopes of these military speculators were soon dashed by the cool mortifying treatment which the Muscovites then as now bestowed upon foreigners when once fairly in their power.

Scarcely had the new comers kissed his 'Tzarsky Majestic's hand,' than they were ordered to perform the drill with pike and muskets before one of the boyars in a field outside the town. This little suited the Scotchmen's notions of an officer's dignity; nevertheless, they were forced to obey. Their exercise gave satisfaction, and each man received a gratuity of twenty-five roubles, and an equal value of sables, cloth, and damask. We should say, they *were* to receive these gifts; but the old Adam of Russian officials was not weaker than it is in our day. The boyar's scribe delayed the payment of the Czar's allowances until he should receive a bribe. Patrick Gordon, though he might pocket an affront to his dignity, was roused whenever his pecuniary rights were infringed upon. After two fruitless appeals to the boyar on this subject, he stopped him one day in his coach in the street, and told him, that he did not know whether he, (the boyar,) or his scribe had the greatest power, seeing that the latter did not obey his orders. The Muscovite thane not liking the taunt, sent for his shifty clerk, and, shaking him three or four times by the beard, promised him the knout if he did not settle the matter. At this part of his narration, Gordon breaks out very angrily against the people he had come among, and describes the endeavours he made to cancel his engagement and return to Germany. To be paid at last, when he did get his due, in 'cursed copper money,' was one of his grievances, and no light one, we should think. Of course, all his plans for getting away were defeated, and he soon found himself seriously at work drilling. Some of the customs of the country he seems to have adopted without scruple. He found that where the law is disregarded, a man must take it into his own hands, or lose authority and influence. One striking instance of the application of this truth is recorded in the Diary. A Russian captain gave the Scotch major no little trouble by his contempt of orders. One evening, Gordon, having dismissed the guard, and all his servants but one, sent for his subordinate, and expostulated with him, telling him, that he 'would break his neck one tyme or another.' 'Whereat,' continues the diarist, 'he beginning to storne, I gott him by the head, and, flinging him downe, with a fresh short oaken cudgell I so belaboured

his back and sides, that he was scarce able to rise.' Having discharged his duty as a disciplinarian, the major, when interrogated by his colonel and by the boyar as to the Russian captain's accusations, 'denied all, according to the fashion of this country, where there are not witnesses.' This mode of proceeding was so suitable to the genius of the country, that Gordon gained his end by the withdrawal of the belaboured officer from the regiment.

However great may be the pleasure of breaking the necks of subordinates, Gordon's position in Russia continued to be very unsatisfactory to himself, and he made many vain attempts to draw his pay and quit the country. His habits of abstemiousness seem to have been departed from; 'hearty cups,' 'making merry,' and similar phrases, begin to occur frequently in the part of the Diary that details his life in Russia. The riotous excesses of the other foreign officers disgusted him in his sense of economy, if not of propriety and refinement. He thought of matrimony, and his reasonings on the subject might have appeared advantageously in the controversy on married life with £300 a year, which amused the public some time ago. The prudent major calculated that a wife would be quite as cheap a luxury as continual orgies with his fellow-officers, and that his chances of comfort and happiness would be largely augmented by marriage. His courtship, betrothal, and marriage are briefly and prosaically narrated, though there was an ingredient of romance in the attendant circumstances. The father of the bride, Colonel Philip Albrecht von Bockhoven, who had been in the service of England as well as of Russia, was then a prisoner in Poland; and as the girl was only thirteen when asked in marriage, her mother and uncle were unwilling to agree to it without the father's consent. Gordon exerted himself to obtain the Colonel's liberation, but without effect. After a delay of two years, the marriage was celebrated in the beginning of the year 1665.

The previous year had been signalized by the arrival in Moscow of the Earl of Carlisle's embassy from King Charles II., which terminated unsatisfactorily to both parties. In the war between England and Holland, it was a matter of some moment to the British Government to secure a monopoly of tar and timber exports from Russia to the exclusion of the Dutch. A privilege of this kind had once been granted by Czar Ivan the Terrible to the English, who had taught him the value of Archangel. But when the rebellious Commons of 1649 decapitated King Charles I., the Czar Alexis revoked all privileges that had ever been granted to the sacrilegious people, and forbade them all

intercourse with Holy Russia. The Dutch, their republicanism notwithstanding, made a fine harvest in the field thus cleared of their rivals; and though a restored King Charles strove hard to recover the old position of the most favoured nation, he could not succeed. Lord Carlisle left Moscow in dudgeon, and a Russian boyar, sent to London, returned home full of ill humour. Meanwhile, Alexis, unwilling to break with either of his maritime allies, and desirous of sending an emissary to the Court of St. James's, who should escape observation, bethought him of Gordon's frequent petitions for leave of absence. Accordingly, we find Gordon dispatched in June, 1666, to his native country, with letters for that Sovereign whose image had always strongly affected the imagination of every royalist Scotchman. The obscurity of his position may have been one reason for employing Gordon as a diplomatic agent on this occasion; yet it is clear that he must have inspired the Czar with confidence in his ability and integrity, and that his conduct had not been so unnoticed as he perhaps had imagined. Having to leave his wife behind as a hostage to secure his return, Gordon set forward on his tedious journey, which he chronicles in the most meagre and uninteresting manner, and reached London on the 2nd of October, having been three months and three days on the way. In a time like ours, when every man makes a twelve-shilling volume of his annual trip to Scotland, to Brittany, or to the Pyrenees, Gordon's three months' Diary of travel through countries then almost unknown is singularly bare and unimaginative. And his sojourn in London is treated so speak æsthetically, in a manner equally severe. Considering the men he saw,—Lauderdale, Clarendon, the King,—and the scenes he went through,—dinners, 'merry-makings with enchanting music,' and meetings with old comrades of the German wars,—what a picture-book he might have made of this part of his Diary! But of the element picturesqueness, with which we are beginning now to be rather overdosed, Gordon had not a grain in his composition. No doubt he greatly enjoyed his visit, and the novelty of a high social position in a wealthy country, and at a luxurious court. The King gave him a key of admission to the royal parks and gardens, and further presented him with two hundred pounds. On his departure, the King, with his own hand, gave him a letter to the Czar; and he set off for Russia, pleased and flattered with the reception he had received in England, and doubtless more confident in his ability to make his way in the world. At Hamburg he solicited and obtained an interview with Queen Christina, who walked up and down the room with him, 'discoursing for about an howre.' This is

another place for regretting that the diarist has not been more communicative. Any details by an eye-witness of that strange child of the great Gustavus could hardly fail to be interesting. On reaching Moscow, Gordon was made to feel that the result of his mission was displeasing to the Czar, and he fell into disgrace, which occasioned his being sent with his regiment into the Ukraine, where he was kept, and did good service against the Turks and Tartars. It is just here a great gap occurs in the Diary, namely, from June, 1667, to January, 1677, a period of ten years. Whether it contained a narrative of his wrongs and complaints against the Muscovite government, and has been at their instance destroyed or conveniently lost, it is impossible to say.

The journal for the year 1678 is preserved, and is presented in a summary at page 105 of the volume before us. It contains a narrative of Gordon's first great feat of arms,—the defence of Tchigrin on the Dnieper, which was attacked by an army of 100,000 Turks and Tartars. The perusal of it recalls a chapter in Robinson Crusoe's later adventures, when he returned to England overland. By the side of both his friends and foes, Gordon stands a hero in courage, skill, and resource. The town was taken by the Turks, but Gordon contrived, though completely abandoned by his troops, to fire the powder magazine, and destroy 4,000 of the enemy. He was raised to the rank of major-general. Another gap occurs in the Diary, the volume which relates to the years 1678–1684 being missing. The Czar Alexis died in 1676, and was succeeded by his son Feodor, who kept Gordon at his post in the Ukraine as strictly as his father had done, promoting him at the same time to the chief command in Kieff. In 1682, Feodor died, and his imbecile brother Ivan ascended the throne, the government being conducted by his sister Sophia, and her favourite, Prince Galitzin. At a later period, the boy Peter was admitted to a nominal share of the throne. All these high personages treated Gordon with marked respect, but they would not let him go; his services at Kieff were too valuable to be dispensed with. While manfully doing his duty there, however, fortune was playing into his hands by giving him a friend in the person of François Lefort, then in his twenty-eighth year,—the Swiss captain and engineer who subsequently exercised so potent an influence on the character of Peter the Great, and through him on the destinies of Russia.

In 1685 King James II. ascended the throne of England, and Gordon's sympathy with a Roman Catholic monarch seems to have made him more anxious than ever to return to England. His urgent requests procured him at length six months' leave,

on condition of leaving his wife and children behind in pledge. He took leave of their majesties on the 26th of January, 1686, 'receiving a charke (cup or quaigh) of brandy out of the yongest his hand, with a command from him to returne speedily.' Peter was then fourteen years old, and this was Gordon's first interview with him. The second journey to England, which was prolonged to Scotland and Auchleuchries itself, is described in the same bald log-book style which characterized the history of his former journey. He is a more important man now than then, and sees a greater number of people of high standing; but not a single day is suffered to pass without his noting down how much money he spent, and in what way it was spent. He often complains of the dearness of things, and entries like the following are not infrequent: 'Dined with many friends, at the Dutch House by St. James's, and were merry; where it *cost me eleven shillings.*' Not but what a kind and cheerful nature gleams through this farrago of sordid care. Little acts of benevolence turn up more than once, and with his friends he is 'merry' and 'very merry' continually, especially where there is music, and where ladies are of the company; and in the portrait which the Spalding Society have prefixed to the Diary, there is a sparkling expression of humour that the language of the journal does not belie. He seems to have made a most favourable impression on King James's mind. The Monarch paid him marked attention, pressed him to quit Russia, and take service in England; and wrote a special letter to the Czar, requesting Gordon's dismissal from the Russian service, with his wife, family, and effects, 'wee,' so runs the letter, 'having use for the service of such of our subjects as have been bred up in military employment.' The man who, thirty years before, had enlisted as a trooper with Rittmaster Gardin, was now sought for by the King of his native country; and it was within the range of possibility that he should have been the antagonist of William, Prince of Orange, and have commanded the royalist army at the battle of the Boyne. But he was a prize that Russia would not give up. On reaching Moscow, whither he went from Scotland, by way of Elsinore and Riga, Gordon found himself in danger of being reduced to the ranks, and sent to Siberia. The Czars and ministers were deeply offended by King James's letter and Gordon's persevering efforts to quit the service of the state which had so highly promoted him. Gordon found himself compelled to bow before the storm he had raised, and subscribed a petition for pardon, 'conceived in as submissive tearmes and expressions as could be done to God Almighty.' The humiliation thus imposed on him was

probably remembered when the day of reckoning came to the Princess Sophia and the all-powerful Galitzin, and when Gordon, in his turn, was master of the position. Four days after his renewal of allegiance to the Czars came a letter from England appointing him Envoy Extraordinary of King James, a post which he was naturally not allowed to take.

In January, 1687, he was on his march to the Crimea, as quartermaster-general to a vast force destined to attack the Tartars. The expedition was rendered abortive by the failure of grass, the steppes having been set on fire either by the Tartar enemies or Cossack allies of the Russians. The year 1688, so eventful in the annals of his own country, Gordon spent quietly in Moscow. The young Peter began this year to take an interest in the government, spite of his sister and her minister. He attended a privy council for the first time in January. He picked soldiers, fifers, and drummers, out of Gordon's regiment, to attend on himself, and feed his military aspirations. In the following January he was married to the Princess Lapuchin. He opposed the minister by strongly disapproving of certain rewards distributed among the officers who had taken part in a second abortive expedition towards Crim Tartary. This was in July, 1689. Sophia and Galitzin felt the danger, and on the 7th of August attempted a *coup d'état*, which failed. Peter, whom they attempted to crush, had time to escape out of bed into a wood; and, after dressing himself there, he galloped forty versts to Troitzka monastery, where he threw himself on the protection of the superior. From this sanctuary Peter summoned the Strelitzes and soldiers of the guard to join him. Sophia forbade the march. Peter then sent a written order, addressed to the foreign officers. Gordon took it to Galitzin, to know what was to be done, since they could not, he said, disobey the Czar's orders on peril of their lives. Galitzin, dissembling his fears, said he would consult with the elder Czar and the Princess, and send him an answer before night. Gordon at once made up his mind to join Peter, and announced his resolution to the other officers. They agreed to accompany him, and the next morning the principal military force of Moscow was at the gates of Troitzka Convent, awaiting the orders of the young Czar. Four days later, a triumphal entry into Moscow completed the revolution, and the reign of Peter the Great began.

Gordon, having played so important a part in the transaction, was taken into favour, and to the end of his life preserved Peter's confidence. After certain executions of the disaffected, burning, knouting, banishing, and confiscating, the Czar applied himself with new zest to his favourite amusements of letting off

fireworks and drinking brandy. Both these exciting occupations had their drawbacks. Colonel Strasburg, Gordon's son-in-law, who had charge of the fireworks, received so many injuries at various times, that he died of them; and on the 26th of February, 1690, 'a five-pound rocket went wrong, and carried off the head of a boyar.' On August 27th, in the same year, 'the Czar was so delighted with the fireworks, that he made the boyars, counsellors, and officers stay with him, and carouse all night in the great hall. During the debauch, *he took offence at something that was said*, and was not pacified but with the greatest difficulty.' A mad-drunk monarch, with absolute power of life and death in his breath, could be no enviable society. Gordon contributed to the display of fireworks after his own fashion. On the Czar's birthday, he drew up his regiment in line three deep, the first rank kneeling, the second stooping, the third standing. In this position they fired all at once, while their drums were beat, and their banners waved, so much to the delight of the Czar, that he ordered it to be repeated again and again. The feasts of this royal personage seem to have been as long as they were riotous. On one occasion, Gordon was ordered to prepare a dinner and supper for his majesty and court for the next day. The guests arrived at ten o'clock in the morning, and immediately sat down to table. 'The Czar was accompanied by eighty-five persons of distinction, with about a hundred servants. They were all very merry, both at dinner and at supper, and *spent the night* as if in camp.' If the general preserved his habits of penuriousness,—and avarice is said to be a good *old-gentlemanly* vice,—ruinous visits of this kind must have caused him many a pang. Pangs of another kind he suffered by his own confession on the morrow of these merry-makings with his lusty young sovereign.

More serious work, however, was taken in hand. The siege of Azof, which in 1695 had proved a failure most destructive, was made successful in 1696 mainly by an ingenious device of Gordon's, familiar to readers of Russian history. Having a large number of men at his absolute disposal, (no haughty guardsmen who dared say, 'We are here to fight, not to dig,') he caused a rampart of earth to be raised by the army just out of the range of the enemy's guns. Employing 12,000 men behind this rampart, he rolled it over like a huge snowball, by shovelling the earth continually from the bottom to the top, until it fell over in front; and, advancing steadily to the city moat, filled it up, and so completely commanded the town, that the Governor was obliged to capitulate.

In 1697, Peter, setting out on his travels through Europe, left Gordon second to General Schein as chief of the military

affairs of the empire ; and in the year following, the Czar being still absent, occurred that dangerous mutiny of the Strelitzes, which might have cost Peter his crown but for Gordon's vigour and severity. The perusal of those pages of the Diary in which we are told how this formidable insurrection was quelled, would have been very instructive, when the public mind in England was excited by the vengeance executed on the mutinous Sepoys in India. Gordon met the rebels on the road as they were marching for Moscow, resolved to assert their ancient rights, which the formation of a regular army had interfered with. He expostulated with them, sent messengers to them, entreated them to return to their obedience ; and, when all his appeals had proved futile, he surrounded their camp and poured grape-shot among them. The force of this argument was irresistible ; the insurgents were taken prisoners, a certain number of them tried, tortured, and put to death. The judgment was very severe ; but in its defence may be urged the enormity of the crime, in a military point of view, which the general had to punish, and the recent exasperation and alarm which it had occasioned. No such excuse can be offered for Peter's brutality on his return to Moscow from Vienna two months later, when the insurrection had been quelled and the wound in the state had begun to heal over. The cruelties he then practised on the remaining Strelitzes are but too sure a proof of the abiding ferocity of his temper, from which others were doomed to suffer in later days. He took part in the execution of the unfortunate men who had formed the body-guard of his father's person. For the sake of expedition they marched up to death in detachments, and laid a long row of heads on blocks provided for the purpose, which were cut off by various executioners, among whom were boyars, high functionaries, and the Czar himself.

To those who love to forge links for binding together different periods of history one incident of this bloody assize may prove interesting. One of the condemned won the admiration of Peter, and obtained his pardon, by a reckless hardihood of demeanour that would have done honour to a Red Indian chief. Finding a head upon the block on which he was about to lay his own, he rudely brushed it off with his hand, saying, ' What dost thou here ? this place is for me.' Restored to life and liberty, the bold Strelitz, whose native place was Orel, adopted the surname of Orloff. Little did Peter think that of that man's grandchildren one would strangle the third Peter, autocrat of Russia, while another should share his throne, in all but in name, with the most renowned Empress of her time.

Gordon's nature was possibly originally averse from bloodshed.

The horrors he shared in, we fancy, must have sickened him. On the 6th of July, 1698, occurs the following singular entry in the Diary, immediately after an entry on the 4th, which enumerates the number of persons shot, wounded, and executed, at the first quelling of the mutiny:—‘This day, after devotion, I, with many more, were confirmed by the Bishop of Ancyra, called Petrus Paulus de St. Joseph, of the Carmelite order: I taking the name of Leopoldus, and my son Theodorus that of Joseph.’ Gordon’s journal closes at the end of the same year, the autumn of which Peter had occupied with the ruthless extermination of the Strelitzes and their partisans. The last entry but one indicates the barbarity of the Czar. ‘Orders were issued not to give support to any of the wives or children of the executed Strelitzes.’ The last entry of all, on the 31st of December, is one of pious aspiration. ‘Almighty God be praised for His gracious long-suffering towards me in sparing my life so long! Grant, gracious God, that I may make a good use of the time that Thou mayest yet be pleased to grant me for repentance. This year I have felt a sensible decrease of health and strength. Yet Thy will be done, gracious God.’ Such prayers can never grow old or stale while poor mortality remains sensible of the brevity and imperfection of its nature. Gordon lived some months after the close of the Diary, dying on the 29th of November, 1699. ‘The Czar, who had visited him five times in his illness, and had been twice with him during the night, stood weeping by his bed as he drew his last breath; and the eyes of him who had left Scotland a poor unfriended wanderer, were closed by the hands of an Emperor.’

It is hardly presumptuous to say that he would rather have closed them in his native land, whither he had always yearned to return; and it is more than probable that the dying man’s thoughts reverted once and again to the barren rocks of Aberdeenshire, and to the modest lairdship of Auchleuchries.—The deceased General was buried with the highest honours in the Roman Catholic chapel, the first stone edifice which had been allowed to be built for that community in Moscow, and the main cost of which had been borne by brave Patrick Gordon.

ART. X.—*Essays and Reviews*. London: J. W. Parker and Sons. 1860.

WE should hardly be faithful to our trust if we suffered this remarkable volume to run its course without a single word of comment. But anything like a review of it is out of the question. The wide variety and supreme importance of the subjects with which it deals forbid the attempt to examine it as a whole or in detail; moreover, each of its individual topics, we may hope, has had or will have its separate consideration in these pages. As a representative book, however, giving us an elaborate specimen of the latest theology of the Neologian section of the English Church, and a well-digested statement of the principles on which modern Oxford is prepared to join in the effort to loose the Christian faith from its fetters, it fairly demands from us a passing notice.

The Table of Contents has a most imposing air; indeed, few books in our time have come before the world with more pretension than this. Seven Professors and Clergymen of the English communion, most of them already highly distinguished and occupying places of eminent trust, promise us the discussion of some of the gravest questions of the day,—questions on which all earnest hearts are deeply musing in these times, and most of which have an immeasurable importance for all times. These writers deprecate the reader's assumption of any combination or concert on their part. But there is a marvellous harmony, more than fortuitous, reigning throughout their joint production. With the exception of the first—though that is scarcely an exception—they breathe the same spirit; there is one key-note,—that of the last Essay,—and the desolate strain of an emancipated, creedless, semi-mystical Christianity is without any perceptible discord. Without attempting a formal analysis of the individual Essays, we shall strive to give, honestly and succinctly, the sum of several, at least, of these separate contributions to the whole.

The first is by Dr. Temple, Head Master of Rugby, on *The Education of the World*, and contains, as might be expected, very much valuable matter. The Essay has all the freshness, breadth, and vagueness which have so much charmed and so extensively influenced a large portion of the English public since the first publication of Arnold's writings. It begins with a fine realistic view of the human race as one colossal man, the continuous organic variety of whose life reaches from the creation to the day of judgment. The successive generations of

men are days in this man's life. The inventions of different epochs are his works; their creeds and opinions are his thoughts; the state of society at different times is his manners: he grows in knowledge, in self-control, in visible size, just as we do; and his education is in the same way, and for the same reason, precisely similar to ours. Each generation receives the benefit of the cultivation of that which preceded it. Not only in knowledge, but in development of powers, the child of twelve now stands at the level where once stood the child of fourteen, where ages ago stood the full-grown man. There is then a childhood, a youth, and a manhood of the world. Its training has three stages: in its childhood, by positive rules; in its youth, by examples; in its maturity, by principles;—answering to the Law, the Son of Man, the gift of the Spirit.

The race during the ancient economy was under the discipline of law. The Hebrew people, being selected as the depository of religious truth, received, after a short preparation, the Mosaic system. The law was a positive ruler of the conscience; but was followed in maturer childhood by the comments of the prophets, comments which merge the mere ordinances in the higher precepts, which are more argumentative than peremptory, and which, while insisting on obedience still, yet treat the child as old enough to understand. The results of the whole discipline of the Jewish nation may be summed up in two points,—a settled national belief in the unity and spirituality of God, and an acknowledgment of the paramount importance of chastity as a primary element of morals. Thus was the conscience of the young race trained in the Hebrew people.

But other nations were being trained simultaneously, though their training was conducted without direct revelation. Rome, Greece, and Asia, contributed to make up the aggregate of the infant race. Rome contributed to the future youth, or the Christian Church, her discipline of order and government; Greece contributed her lesson of science, and art, and refinement; Asia, her mystical element. 'Thus the Hebrews may be said to have disciplined the human conscience, Rome the human will, Greece the reason and taste, Asia the spiritual imagination.'

The childhood of the world was over when our Lord appeared. The tutors and governors had done their work. The second teacher was example, the influence of which attains its maximum at the meeting-point of the child and the man, in the brief interval which separates restraint from liberty. Our Lord, the Example of mankind, came 'in the fulness of time,' just when the world was fitted to feel the power of His presence.

Had He come earlier, the world would not have been ready, and the Gospel would have been the religion of the Hebrews only. Had He come later, He would have come to mankind already beginning to stiffen into the fixedness of maturity. But, besides this supreme and only Example, there were three other companions who exerted something of the same kind of influence upon the disciplined youth of the race, as thus being trained by a Divine education,—Greece, Rome, and the early Church: the first, a brilliant social companion; the second, a bold and successful leader; and the third, an earnest, heavenly-minded friend, whose sanctity and manners are still the cherished remembrance of the world.

Lastly came the age of reflection, in which the man begins to draw from the storehouse of youthful experience the principles of life. The spirit of conscience assumes the throne. There he frames his code of laws—the third great teacher, and the last. In the individual man, however, there is still a process of learning and discipline going on. He learns by the growth of his inner powers, and the accumulation of experience; his freedom is the restraint of law; and the inner law of mature life, and the outer law of childhood, are still more or less combined. So was it with the Christian Church, as the representative of mankind. The Church was left to work out, by her own natural faculties, the principle of her own action. She began by determining her leading doctrines and the principles of her conduct. Reflection, and formula, and contest with heresy, evolved the hasty, dogmatic creeds of the early ages. These generalizations of early manhood were right on the whole; that is, they always embodied, if they did not always rightly define, the truth. But the Church was not capable of exhausting at once all the truth and wisdom contained in the teaching of the earlier periods. It exaggerated its proper function; it claimed what the apostles did not claim,—not only to teach the truth, but to clothe it in logical statements, not merely as opposed to prevailing heresies, (which was justifiable,) but for all succeeding time. It belongs to a later epoch to see the ‘law within the law,’ which absorbs such statements into something higher than themselves. But then came the flood of undisciplined races, which carried the Church back to the dominion of outer law. The instinct of the Church revived Judaism in the Papacy—her instinct, not her intention. Then came the removal of the mediæval yoke, when the time arrived that the conscience might again be the supreme guide. But with it returned, not the old dogmatism, but an entirely new lesson,—the lesson of toleration,—modifying the early dogmatism, by

substituting the spirit for the letter, and practical religion for precise definitions of truth. This lesson we are slowly but steadily learning. Science, research, and free thought, have shown that 'there are more things in heaven and earth than were dreamt of in the Patristic theology.' We can use their forms, but go beyond them; just as they went beyond the legacy left them by the Apostles. The Bible is suited to our self-education; being without any despotic power, which its very form denies to it, and given to conscience as its supreme interpreter. The mature age of the Church must be governed by knowledge, knowledge alone, and the principles which it establishes. The thorough study of the Bible, therefore,—the investigation of what it teaches and what it does not teach, the determination of the limits of what we mean by its inspiration, and the degree of authority of its various books,—must take the lead of all other studies. Toleration must guide that study; and then it will not be the study of those who go back to that view of the Bible which corresponds with the childhood and youth of the world,—which is only a perverted use of it,—but of those who fear not the result of any investigation, whether philosophical, or scientific, or historical. Its power over the minds and hearts of believers will never be weakened by our clearing away the blunders which have been fastened on it by human interpretation.

This is a fair summary of the Essay, which, while it elaborates its great idea with masterly power, seems to us to be grievously unfaithful to one of its leading principles. 'The gift of the Spirit' is stated at the outset to be the distinguishing mark of the mature age of the colossal man. Why then is *He*—not *it*—no further mentioned? Has not the mature man of humanity—the living Church of Christ—received the promise of the Holy Ghost to abide with him for ever? And ought not that great element in the *self-education* of the mature world to be interwoven, and receive its fair estimation? Such a mature man as is here described, without the supreme ascendancy and direction of the Holy Spirit, is as a body without a head. This ruinous defect vitiates the whole of this first Essay, with all its masterly generalization; and therefore it foreshadows, though faintly, all the errors which are more glaringly exhibited in the six which follow.

In the second paper *Bunsen's Biblical Researches* are described and extolled by a congenial spirit,—Dr. Rowland Williams, Vice-Principal of St. David's College, Lampeter, and the well-known vindicator of 'Christian Freedom.' In his eyes Baron Bunsen seems to be, in many respects, the foremost man in Chris-

tendom, 'who, in our darkest perplexity, has reared again the banner of truth, and uttered thoughts which give courage to the weak, and sight to the blind,'—one of the ablest, if not the ablest, of those champions of light and right to whom we are to look for the salvation of Protestant Europe from those shadows of the twelfth century which, with ominous recurrence, are closing around us. Let us sum up the Teuton's claims to this championship, as they are here dilated upon by his reverent and affectionate admirer or pupil.

The war-cry of Bunsen's assault upon the powers of modern darkness is the question, 'How long shall we hear this fiction of an *external* revelation?'—language which his coadjutor in the Anglican Church admits may be thought 'too vehement for good taste,' but which he classes with other *very bold* sayings of the prophet, as 'burning words needed by the disease of our time.' The 'Bible for the Church' is intended to be the final and effectual panacea for all those particular symptoms of a disease which may be classed under the head of Bibliolatry. In this 'Bible-work,' we shall have the latest—we fear, not the last—German reconstruction of the Word of God. There was a Bible before our present Bible; and that some of our present books, as certainly Genesis and Joshua, and perhaps Job, Jonah, Daniel, are expanded from simpler elements, is indicated in this book rather than proved, as Dr. Williams thinks it might be. The great merit of Bunsen is, that he has gathered into himself all the light of the Illuminist criticism of the Scriptures, from Eichhorn to Ewald, which has been the glory of the past century; that he has entered into the heritage of past scholarship; that is to say, that he has given up all the symbolism of the types, all the prediction of prophecy, and the distinctive inspiration of the whole Bible, and yet does not despair of Hebrew prophecy as a witness to the kingdom of God.

Hebrew prophecy, however, as it is here criticized down to its legitimate dimensions, is worth very little, whether as a witness to its own age, or as a witness for ages to come. Woful is the havoc made of the Prophets, both the greater and the less. The 'older Isaiah' is left with some fragments of the earlier part of his book; the rest he must be content to share with the interpolators. As to the latter part of his roll, he must surrender it with all its glory to a *pseudo-Isaiah*. With all its glory, we have said; but in truth its glory is departed; for there is no one greater in the very sanctuary of the book, where the Man of Sorrows is, than Jeremiah, or one of the Prophets, or the idealized afflicted people of God. This may suffice instead of a multitude of examples; when once Scripture, in the person

of its greatest mortal Prophet, is thus broken, it matters not that Daniel with his visions is lost, that Jonah is a 'late legend, founded on misconception,' that Jeremiah gives place to Baruch, that Zechariah must yield the best part of his prophecies to Uriah or some one else, and that a multitude of mutilations, dislocations, and violences are done to all the rest; for, indeed, which of the Prophets has not this criticism persecuted and dishonoured? Far as Bunsen, the inheritor of the illumination of a century of criticism, goes, Dr. Williams sometimes betrays a little impatience with his master's comparative tardiness and restraint. The German faintly endeavours to make a compromise with his conscience, by appealing to a certain mysterious principle of insight in human nature, which in Hebrew prophecy may have been exalted beyond its range in other men. The Englishman is hardly fair in his translation of the words; but he cannot concede, even to Bunsen, anything more than presentiment or sagacity. For himself, he reduces the Christology of prophecy to this: As John the Baptist answers the question, *Art thou Elias?* by his express, *I am not*, while yet Jesus testifies that in spirit and power this was Elias; so, by the help of a little reflection, we may come to perceive that the grief and triumph of Isaiah liii. have their highest fulfilment;—but we forbear to go any further with the quotation. 'We must not distort the Prophets to prove the Divine Word incarnate, and then from the incarnation reason back to the sense of prophecy. Loudly do justice and humanity exclaim against such traditional distortion of prophecy, as makes their own sacred writings a ground of cruel prejudice against the Hebrew people, and the fidelity of this remarkable race to the oracles of their fathers, a handle for social obloquy. The cause of Christianity itself would be the greatest gainer if we laid aside weapons, the use of which brings shame.' This simple sentence of our Hebrew Professor, pursued to its fair conclusions, annihilates Christianity, and shuts the Bible at once.

He, however, thinks very differently. To him the great result of all is to vindicate the work of the Eternal Spirit, that abiding influence which underlies all others, and which is the common source of inspiration to all good men, good thoughts, and good books. 'The sacred writers acknowledge themselves men of like passions with ourselves, and we are promised illumination from the Spirit which [not who?] dwells in them.'

The doctrines which, under this illumination of the sacred influence, Bunsen and his English panegyrist derive from the Scriptures, are in harmony with this lax view of inspiration. Doctrines they are not at all, strictly speaking; for this kind of

theology admits of no definitions and formal statements of truth. As the Holy Spirit is an influence, and the Scriptures of truth (so called) are simply the voice of the Church of all ages, there can be no dogmatic truth apart from its influence upon every individual mind; the objective is merged in one everlasting and ever-varying subjective reproduction of the ideas of truth; and what men call 'doctrine' must needs change from generation to generation. 'Almighty God has been pleased to educate men and nations, employing imagination no less than conscience, and suffering His lessons to play freely within the limits of humanity and its short-comings.' The elements of good were to be found in all the more ancient or more modern religions of India and of Arabia, and even in those of Hellas and Latium. Thus revelation widens its range, to comprehend the truth of every system; and at the same time relaxes its rigour, in accommodation to the errors of every system. All the religious books of the world are one great Bible, of which the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures contain certain sublime but loosely-preserved books. Some of them exhibit more adulteration of error, some less, but none are altogether without error. There is no positive revelation of truth adapted to every age. All that is fixed and stable in Divine truth belongs rather to natural than to what we call revealed religion. And for the one as for the other we have in ourselves a supreme verifying faculty; a secret, individual, absolute test; the *witness in ourselves*.

It is in his *Hippolytus* (or the work which came out first under that name) that Bunsen approaches nearest to the exposition of his dogmatic views. That work is commended to us as 'a congeries of subjects, but yet a whole, pregnant and suggestive beyond any book of our time. To lay deep the foundation of faith in the necessities of the human mind, and to establish its confirmation by history, distinguishing the local from the universal, and translating the idioms of priesthoods or races into the broad speech of humanity, are amongst parts of the great argument.' With this sentence, so far as we understand it, we agree; it is a fair character of the most astonishing work which has amazed the present generation. But it is very sad and very suggestive to mark in what way the learned renovator of Christianity proceeds in his task of translating the idioms of Apostles into the broad speech of humanity.

Jesus the Christ of God is in this translation the perfect embodiment of that religious idea which is the thought of the Eternal, and without conformity to which our world cannot be saved. The incarnation is purely spiritual; the son of David by birth is the Son of God by the Spirit of holiness. The kingdom

of God is the realization of the Divine will in our thoughts and lives; this expression of spirit, in deed and form, is generically akin to creation, and illustrates the dogma and fact of the incarnation. For, though the true substance of Deity took body in the Son of Man, it is a mistake to interpret this in any other sense than that in which we understand the declaration that he who abides in love abides in God, and God in him. Hence, the doctrine of the Trinity is a 'philosophical rendering of the first chapter of St. John's Gospel. The profoundest analysis of our world leaves the law of thought as its ultimate basis and bond of coherence. This thought is consubstantial with the Being of the Eternal I AM.' The Trinity, or rather Triad, is will, wisdom, and love; the Divine Consciousness or Wisdom, consubstantial with the Eternal Will, becoming personal in the Son of man, is the express image of the Father; and Jesus actually, but also mankind ideally, is the Son of God. If all this has a Sabellian or almost Brahmanical sound, these divines are not careful to defend themselves from an imputation which as they think must equally fall on some of the earliest and best of the Fathers of the Church.

With the dissolution of the Holy Trinity, and the idealizing of the incarnation, it follows of necessity that the blessed doctrines which revolve around our redemption must suffer loss, irreparable loss. It is utterly impossible to put into language the ideas which are represented to this class of theologians by the words 'atonement,' 'propitiation,' 'justification,' 'heaven,' and 'hell.' In fact, they are quite consistent with themselves and their principles in entirely rejecting all positive definitions; to them St. Paul's 'form of sound words' has no meaning whatever. It will almost invariably be found, that their statements of doctrine—or what should be such—are no more than negations, generally sarcastic and most unfair, and sometimes irreverent negations, of the doctrines which have represented for ages the faith once delivered to the saints. This volume contains a multitude of illustrations of what we mean; but the Essay before us will furnish as many as we have space to refer to. Christ is 'the moral Saviour of mankind;' and in this adjective 'moral' lies a world of vague protest against the truth; but no adjective in either the German or the English language has a less definable meaning than this one, and therefore is it chosen. Salvation is 'deliverance, not from the life-giving God, but from evil and darkness, which are His finite opposites, (*ὁ ἀντικείμενος*). Now, 'redemption' should be the word here, but 'redemption' is by no means a favourite expression, and might be very conveniently spared altogether by this divinity. But is it true, that our 'irrational interpreta-

tion' represents the Saviour's work in delivering us from the 'life-giving God?' How can it be so, when the most rigid doctrine of satisfaction declares that the Redeemer is God Himself, and that He came to manifest God's eternal love by the very sacrifice of Himself, which manifested His own eternal wrath against sin? And is it worthy of one of our greatest masters of Greek—for it is Dr. Williams, and not Bunsen, who is speaking here—to suggest, even in the most passing manner, such a reference to that masculine adjective of St. Paul as applicable to 'evil and darkness?' Propitiation is 'the recovery of that peace, which cannot be while sin divides us from the Searcher of hearts.' Now this equivocal phrase is either a designed and deliberate perversion of the plainest teaching of the whole Scripture, or it is a most unworthy evasion of the matter by the use of plausible words which mean nothing, or it is a wilful substitution of the effect for the cause, because that cause is hateful to the new theology. Justification by faith is 'that peace of mind, or sense of Divine approval, which comes of trust in a righteous God, rather than a fiction of moral transfer.' It is 'neither an arbitrary ground of confidence, nor a reward upon condition of our disclaiming merit, but rather a verdict of forgiveness upon the offering of our hearts.' Regeneration is a 'correspondent giving of insight, or an awakening of forces of the soul.' Original sin declines the exaggerated definition which 'makes the design of God to be altered by the first agents in His creation, or destroys the notion of moral choice and the foundation of ethics.' This is suggestively negative; but the Fall of man has its positive definition: 'It represents with him ideally the circumscription of our spirits in limits of flesh and time, and practically the selfish nature with which we fall from the likeness of God, which should be fulfilled in man.' These and other such rhetorical flourishes of definition involve miserable parodies of the doctrines which they supplant, and in themselves betray—as every one must perceive, who weighs them for a moment—most hopeless confusion of thought and expression. Did the exact Apostle, for instance, mean by justification at once a sense of approval, and a verdict of forgiveness? Is his language wont to waver thus? But it is to Dr. Williams of very little moment what St. Paul intended; for the instincts of natural religion are the final appeal with him, and 'the antagonism between nature and revelation vanishes in a wider grasp and deeper perception of the one, or in a better balanced statement of the other.'

But it was not our purpose to enter at present upon an extended examination of the phase of modern Anglican theology

which Dr. Williams represents. Our only aim has been to give some account of the several Essays, with the running comment of a few such general defensive remarks as may be introductory to a future and more thorough sketch of the dogmatics of this new theology. But, before we dismiss this elaborate and glowing eulogy of Bunsen, a remark is due to the historical element in his biblical labours. 'On the side of history lies the strength of his genius;' that is to say, the results of his almost fabulous researches are more entirely to Dr. Williams' mind than the definitions of his layman theology, which, strange to say, to his panegyrist's ears, as well as to ours, vibrates sometimes in a very suspicious manner between orthodoxy and illuminism. Now, in our conviction, the doctrine of the whole Bible, and the history of the whole Bible, are bound indissolubly together. To Bunsen and Williams, and a very large and increasing number of men in this age bearing the name of Christians, it is not so. The revelation of God is not connected with the Old and New Testament by a bond different in kind, or different in degree, from that which connects and unites a multitude of other books, which express the moral convictions of earnest men in all ages. They are emancipated from the bondage of 'the despairing school, who forbid us trust in God or in conscience, unless we kill our souls with literalism; and they find salvation for men and states only in becoming acquainted with the Author of our life, by whose reason the world stands fast, whose stamp we bear on our forethought, and whose voice our conscience echoes.' The Bible is to them 'an expression of devout reason, and therefore to be read with reason in freedom;' it contains, in the midst of a large mass of human tradition and legend, a record of a living succession of spiritual giants, whose experience generated the religious atmosphere we breathe. The ancient fathers of the race transmitted these 'views' of religion, and the rational service of God, to their posterity; as far as we have a 'kindred apprehension,' their life quickens in us; and we must 'give back what we have received, or perish by unfaithfulness to our trust.' The only Bible, therefore, which they accept, is the great mass of all the principles of reason and right scattered in the writings of the world, to which 'our heart perpetually responds, and our response to which is a truer sign of faith, than such deference to a supposed external authority as would quench these principles themselves. Though they might protest against the conclusions which we draw from their premises, and devise all manner of subtle expedients for their own defence, yet these conclusions will be sanctioned and affirmed by the honest logic of all less sophisticated minds: to wit, that it has been a superstitious mistake to

make the Bible the pre-eminent Book of the world; that the Old and New Testaments have no more than a fortuitous connexion; that in fact the so-called Revelation of God, which has so mysteriously swayed the destinies of the modern civilized world, is no more than the 'expression of Jewish notions of reason and right;' that all the books should be unbound and dispersed again into the common mass of human literature, to receive the verdict of men's instincts without the conventional sanctions and irrational assumptions that have so long shielded them; that the personal Jesus Christ of the Christian Church should cease to be the King supreme in all the domain of religious knowledge; and that men should learn to pay more respect to the ideal Christ, who is speaking in every age, and in all honest and true hearts, the things that pertain to His kingdom. We know that a certain reverence, or the instinct of a certain unforgotten tradition within them, will cause these writers to revolt against such sentences, especially the last of them,—for they abound in a certain unreal and indefinable loyalty to the Word in whom was incarnate the thought of God which is working in the ages,—but these are, nevertheless, the legitimate results of all their theorizing. This is the *way of the Gentiles* in which their theology is moving; and the miserable inconsistency between their profound subjection to the authority of Jesus, and their daring rejection of the testimony which He bears to the earlier Scriptures which converged to Him, and to those later Scriptures which He would afterwards develop through the Apostles, from the remembrance of His own words,—is not an inconsistency which our acrimony or fear invents, but one which most obviously pervades their whole theory, if any theory they have, of the inspiration of Holy Scripture. They profess to listen reverently to the Incarnate Word; but there are utterances of His lips inseparable from all His teaching, which overthrow the very foundation of their hypothesis concerning the Old-Testament Scriptures. His testimony to the integrity of the Bible is bound up with all His testimony; and no man can read Moses and the Prophets as these men read them, until he has virtually renounced his allegiance to the great Witness of truth.

Baron Bunsen's historical researches into the text and sequence of the books of Scripture are now proceeding with all the vigour of his green old age; and the time is not come for a full examination of his claims to be 'the creator of a new epoch in the science of Biblical criticism.' Like Humboldt, he is at present summing up the colossal labours of a long life, in what is to be his greatest memorial to posterity. Part after part of that work reaches us in England, and short that he is by no means

receding from the latitudinarian, or rather sceptical, principles which regulated his earlier researches. The latest documents which he has given to the world seem indeed to refresh Dr. Williams's spirit,—if we may judge by the note at the end of the volume,—by the evidence which they give of a 'firmer freedom' in handling the technical definition of miracles, and in the analysis of the Levitical laws by which the Mosaic germs are distinguished from subsequent accretions. But we firmly believe that the merciful Providence of the Holy Spirit is raising up in that land of indefatigable scholars, as well as in our own land, men who will be able to counterwork in the most effectual manner the 'Bible-work' which is now labouring to its completion. Leaving, however, what is to come, let us turn for a moment to what we have.

The work entitled *Egypt's Place in Universal History* contains the learned author's mature decisions on the Pentateuch and the later historical books of Scripture. There we find him revelling, with all the cumbrous many-sidedness of a finished German scholar, in all the most abstruse and complicated questions which philology, ethnology, and the oriental cosmogonies give birth to. And as is the profundity of his investigations, so is the fertility of his theories. But the results of all this extraordinary research it is very painful to contemplate. The reader will forecast them in the 'quaint strength'—as Dr. Williams calls it—of the *dictum*, that 'there is no chronological element in Revelation.' Hence, all the dates of the Hebrew Bible, even when rectified by the Septuagint, are simply wrong. Egyptian records, confirmed by arguments derived from the laws of the development of government and commerce, and still more of languages, and physical characteristics of race, demand a vast extension of time in the forefront of human history—say twenty thousand years. The civilized kingdom of Egypt extends—if we are to receive the dynastic record of the Ptolemaic priest, Manetho—to an antiquity of nearly four thousand years before Christ. The notices of the beginning of our race are half-ideal, half-traditional compilations. The earliest genealogies yield all manner of fanciful revelations of their legendary character. The long lives of the first patriarchs are relegated to the domain of fiction, or of symbolical cycle. History proper begins with Abraham, where the lives become natural; the journey of Abraham into Egypt is fixed by Bunsen at B.C. 2876; the stay of the Israelites in that land is extended to fourteen centuries; the Exodus—which it is only fair to say is vindicated by Bunsen against all simply infidel attacks—is placed as late as B.C. 1320. All the dislocations in the later

Bible chronology which these hypotheses and dates require are of no account to these historical regenerators of Scripture and scholiasts of Moses. In fact, the question never occurs whether the Hebrew record may possibly be correct. The Hebrew Bible is great, but truth is greater. All must be made to bend to the more important object of establishing some sort of reconciliation between the scriptural record and the profane. And the tone which is assumed by Dr. Williams is that of one who thinks that we should be thankful to have that confirmation at any cost. It seems to him almost more than could have been expected, that the Pentateuch, and the Hebrew history generally, which grew like a tree rooted in the varying thoughts of successive generations, should coincide with the exacter archives of profane history. And, indeed, if the Pentateuch is Mosaic, only as embodying the system of the great lawgiver,—if it was a composition out of older materials, numerous fragments of genealogy, of chronology, and of spiritual song, going up to a high antiquity, but imbedded in a crust of later narrative, the allusions of which betray at least a time when Kings were established in Israel,—then we must admit that the coincidence and agreement with the world's other record, which even Bunsen dimly traces, and which sounder inquirers than he distinctly establish, would be a wonderful phenomenon.

We almost tremble—not for ourselves, but for him—to follow Bunsen into the Bible's holiest of all, the New-Testament history; especially when we are reminded by his eulogist that 'his acceptance of Christ's redemption from evil does not bind him to repeat traditional fictions about our canon, or to read its pages with that dulness which turns symbol and poetry into materialism.' But we find nothing very novel or very formidable in his exhibition of the sources and proper limitations of the New-Testament Scriptures. In fact, Bunsen's criticism is here exceedingly moderate, much more so than his reviewer would be likely to approve. The three Gospels are divergent forms of the tradition, once oral, and perhaps catechetical, in the congregations of the Apostles. The final Gospel is the latest of all the genuine books, and rightly placed near the end of the first century. But the Apocalypse is a series of poetical visions, which represent the outpouring of the vials of wrath upon the city where the Lord was slain. 'Its horizon answers to that of Jerusalem already threatened by the legions of Vespasian, and its language is partly adapted from the older Prophets, partly a repetition of our Lord's warnings, as described by the Evangelists, or as deepened into wilder threatenings in the mouth of the later Jesus, the son of Ananus.' The 'second Petrine Epistle is necessarily abandoned.' The Epistle to the

Hebrews Bunsen is disposed to ascribe to some companion of the Apostle; its different conception of faith, Alexandrine rhythm, and other minute reasons, pointing to Apollos. Dr. Williams, however, discerns in it traces of a *post*-apostolic origin. Generally speaking, it is evident enough that if Bunsen's New Testament would be considerably smaller than our own, Dr Williams's would be smaller still.

But we must leave this Essay, which we have taken some pains to epitomize. That task we have endeavoured to perform in such a manner as to render any final comment upon it superfluous. Suffice to say that the style of biblical criticism which this English Professor and clergyman recommends to the young divines of his Church and country—which, indeed, he heralds as a glorious dawn of a happy revolution in science—is wanting in nothing that the most advanced sections of rational Illuminists could desire.

The fifth Essay, by Mr. Goodwin, approaches the awful mystery of the *Mosaic Cosmogony*. A few quotations and a few comments are all that we can permit ourselves on this sore subject. After an unsparing account of the great contradiction between revelation and science, the writer gives us the spirit of his own contribution to the settlement of the question. 'Believing, as we do, that if the value of the Bible as a book of religious instruction is to be maintained, it must not be by striving to prove it scientifically exact, at the expense of every sound principle of interpretation, and in defiance of common sense, but by the frank recognition of the erroneous views of nature which it contains, we have put pen to paper to analyse some of the popular conciliation theories. Physical science goes on unconcernedly pursuing its own paths. Theology, the science whose object is the dealing of God with man as a moral being, maintains but a shivering existence, shouldered and jostled by the sturdy growth of modern thought, and bemoaning itself for the hostility which it encounters. Why should this be, unless because theologians persist in clinging to theories of God's procedure towards man which have long been seen to be untenable?'

The several theories which have been *impromptu* devised by a surprised theology during the last half century, are dealt with honestly, though unsparingly. Some of them have laid themselves open to hostile criticism, and deserve the contempt which they receive. The Mosaic defences which have set out with a bold though unintelligent defiance of all the discoveries, generalizations, and inductions of geological science, have done nought but mischief to the cause which they aimed to serve. Of these,

however, no mention is made by the essayist. He contents himself with a very fair statement of the present proved facts of geology, and of the most popular among the systems of reconciliation which scientific geologists, being also firm believers in Inspired Revelation, have set up. There is much to admire in the treatment of the subject; and some will think that the theories of Buckland, and others who have modified his views, have a plausibility and, indeed, a strength, as here exhibited, which they had not remarked before. At any rate, the utter hopelessness of any such solution as shall save the Divine origin of the Mosaic Cosmogony, is by no means established by any thing which we find in this Essay.

But we are simply on the defensive, and have only to ask, whether the solution propounded at the close of this Essay is consistent with itself, honourable to the Moral Governor of the race, or satisfactory to any unbiassed mind. The writer admits the great historical fact, that Providence used the Hebrew race, its works and books, to lay the foundation of religion upon the earth. In some sense or other, therefore, he allows the Pentateuch to have been the earliest manual by which the God of truth instructed mankind. But, at the same time, he assumes that 'misrepresentations' may find place in revelation, and that God made use of imperfectly informed men to lay the foundation of that higher knowledge for which the human race was destined. 'There is no difficulty in recognising therein the hand of a directing Providence,' which simply used the guesses and errors of man for the education of mankind. If we regard the Mosaic narrative as the 'speculation of some Hebrew Descartes or Newton, promulgated in all good faith as the best and most probable account that could then be given of God's universe,' it then resumes the dignity and value of which theological geologists have done their utmost to deprive it. And if the reverence of a mind that honours the God of truth, revolts against the thought that God's servant should 'solemnly and unhesitatingly assert that for which he must have known that he had no authority,' the cold answer is, that our modern habits of thought are different from the ancient, that the spirit of true science has taught us modesty of assertion, and that mankind has learnt caution through repeated slips in the process of tracing out the truth.

All this is very dismal; but we leave it with the reader, as we wish in this brief paper to avoid dealing harshly and superficially with subjects which should be handled thoroughly, or not at all.

The last, the longest, and the most important of these Essays is that of Professor Jowett, *On the Interpretation of Scripture*;

containing just such a proclamation of exegetical principles as his recent volumes would lead us to expect. The Pauline Commentary, to which we refer, has found more favour than any work of the same kind; and we doubt not that this elaborate appendage, or *Epilogus galeatus*, will be very extensively studied, and produce its effect.

It is hardly necessary to say that it is a very ingenious and beautiful composition. It may be termed, indeed, a model of graceful, meditative, suggestive writing. But it is a treatise which most of our readers will peruse with pain, and close with a sense of relief. It is simply and essentially negative and destructive. It professes, indeed, to destroy in order to reconstruct; but the destruction is real and sure, the reconstruction of exegetical principles vague and unreal. He should not read it who is not prepared, by intellectual discipline and the establishing grace of God, to witness unharmed a deadly attack upon the foundations of sound exposition. He who is so prepared, however, will find much that he will wish never to forget.

The starting-point of the whole is this, that while Scripture remains the same from age to age, all the interpretation of it that has grown up in all ages has done nothing but reflect the changing atmosphere of the world and the Church. The whole mass of extant exposition,—whether condensed in creeds, or more fully expressed in systems of theology, or accumulated in commentaries,—merely encumbers the meaning of the text. A history of the interpretations of Scripture would prove and illustrate this at once; it would show by what fatal processes the dogmas, systems, and controversies of ages have been encrusted upon the words and phrases of Scripture; it would show how 'the word "inspiration," which may be called the prophetic spirit of Scripture, has passed, within the last two centuries, into a sort of technical term;' it would convince the interpreter that his office must be limited to the simple recovery of the meaning of the words, as they first fell upon the ears of those who heard them; that, forgetting all the afterthoughts of theology, and all the history of Christendom, and renouncing all theories of interpretation, his object must be to read Scripture like any other book, with a real and not merely a conventional interest in its contents.

The history of interpretation, however, would further show that some deeper reasons than merely the spirit of party in theology have hindered the natural meaning of the text from immediately and universally prevailing. And the most important of these is the misapprehension and misuse of the term *inspiration*. All definitions of inspiration—from that which

makes the inspired person a passive utterer of a Divine Word, down to that which makes it the ordinary guidance of the Spirit in a higher degree—err in attempting to explain what, though real, is incapable of being defined in an exact manner. The writers of the New Testament never lay claim to any special inward gift, or to any exemption from error; consequently, we find discrepancies which derive a cumulative weight from their number. So also, he who should have the courage to examine how far the details of prophecy in the Old Testament have been minutely fulfilled, would find that he had taken the letter for the spirit in expecting any such minute fulfilment.

There is then, negatively, no such thing as a definition of inspiration. But the thing itself cannot be set aside as easily as its definition; and the essayist consents to its use on the condition that we accommodate it to fixed principles. First, it must not be itself an *à priori* notion or power; it must not affect the principle, that Scripture is simply what it is worth in itself. There is a 'progression in revelation,' which admits of 'mixed good and evil in the characters of Scripture, which, nevertheless, does not exclude them from the favour of God, with the attribution to the Divine Being of actions at variance with that higher revelation which He has given of Himself in the Gospel;' which admits of imperfect or opposite aspects of the truth as in Job, with variations of fact in the Gospels, and inaccuracies of language in St. Paul. And, secondly, the true doctrine of inspiration must be ready to conform to all well-ascertained facts of history or of science; as the idea of nature enlarges, the idea of revelation also enlarges. We must be ready to correct our views of inspired truth by the discoveries of geology and comparative philosophy, which are likely soon, indirectly, to establish the fact that the history of nations extends back some thousand years before the Mosaic chronology, and that mankind spread not from one but from many centres over the globe, and possibly introduce some entirely new conclusions respecting the origin of man. It is bad policy to set up any theory of inspiration which may peril religion by the mere probability of the untruth of these scientific theories.

Hence, in fact, there is no value whatever in the word *inspiration*. If it were to fall into disuse, no fact of nature, or history, or language, no event in the life of man, or dealings of God with him, would be in any degree altered. The word itself is of yesterday, not found in the earlier Confessions of the reformed faith; its difficulties are only two or three centuries old. The interpreter, therefore, had better not entangle himself with any theory of inspiration.

Having in this vague and ultra-latitudinarian way dismissed the doctrine of inspiration,—though without spending a single sentence upon the express declarations of the Bible, and the highest Speaker in the Bible, on this subject,—Mr. Jowett proceeds to show, with great care and dramatic skill, the withering effects of this popular theory. His first and general charge is, that it has led to a tone of apology which is the reverse of, 'Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free;' that it forgets the great design of our Saviour's appearance: 'To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth;' while elaborately striving to reconcile discrepancies in His recorded history. But to this general charge we may generally reply, that since it has pleased God to give us a revelation so thoroughly incorporated with various history, and requiring research to be understood, it is obviously His will that all who study it should search out the materials for the defence of its truth; and, moreover, that they are most likely to prove faithful and loyal subjects of the Great Witness to the truth who set out, in spite of all seeming difficulty, with the predetermination to find all His words true; who are resolute in believing that all Scripture will verify His words who said, that 'the Scripture cannot be broken.'

The evil influence, however, of 'higher or supernatural views of inspiration' is more particularly exhibited and illustrated by the temper of accommodation which adapts the truths of Scripture to the doctrines of the creeds, and the maxims of Scripture to the practice of our own age. That is to say, it has been an error from the beginning to find the later doctrines of the Church in Scripture; and there has also been great error in the application of the ideal of Christian practice to the actual state of the world.

The creeds are acknowledged to be a part of Christianity; it is admitted that they stand in a close relation to the words of Christ and His apostles; and it is further conceded that no heterodox formula makes a nearer approach to a simple and scriptural rule of faith. But they must not be pressed into the service of the interpreter. The doctrinal language of the Church is the result of three or four centuries of reflection and controversy; the human understanding had been at work, and the Christian consciousness which received the creeds was no longer the Christian consciousness which received the whole of Christianity in the words, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou mayest be saved.' To attribute to St. Paul the abstract notions of the Nicene Creed, is the same sort of anachronism as to attribute to him a system of philosophy. He would not have spoken

of his Master as 'equal to the Father,' or 'of one substance with the Father.' And similarly, the Gospels would be filled with difficulties by the attempt to identify them with the creeds. To render this assertion more plausible, Mr. Jowett is impartial enough to show that the precise definitions of Unitarianism would be equally inconsistent with certain express sayings of the New Testament.

If the mist is cleared away from this part of the Essay, its simple meaning will be found to be that there is no *doctrine*—truth there is, but no doctrine—in the Scriptures of God; that St. John and St. Paul had not themselves, and did not therefore express, any definite apprehensions of the One Person and Twofold Nature of the Redeemer; that their sublime doctrines of revealed religion were never intended to be reduced to clearer formulary; that the 'noble progress of these ideas' was not under the revealing care of the Holy Spirit, dwelling in the Church and making it the pillar and ground of the truth; that all the truths of Scripture must remain for ever undefined, and that all dogmatic theology is a presumptive mistake. All this we steadfastly deny; but these are questions which will come up again further on, or at another time.

Great pains are next expended in showing that a mistaken view of inspiration has led to a perilous neglect of the necessary contrast between the ideal and the actual in the interpretation of Scripture. The words and ideas of Scripture have been unfairly dealt with: some texts, though merely isolated and 'chance words,' have been dragged by force into the service of received opinions and beliefs; while other texts and expressions, not seemingly in harmony with existing practices and opinions, have been neglected or explained away. Among many instances of the former error—that is to say, the too literal and real rendering of ideal expressions—is the use made of 2 Tim. iii. 16 to support the doctrine of inspiration; of John xiv. 26, xvi. 15, (words 'which seem to come out of the depths of a Divine consciousness,') to support the doctrine of the personality of the Holy Ghost; and of 1 Cor. xv. 22, Rom. v. 12, ('two figurative expressions of St. Paul,' to which there is no parallel in any other part of Scripture,) to support the doctrine of original sin. Mr. Jowett admits that some of the instances (but none of the three we have quoted!) refer to doctrines which have sufficient grounds, but that the weakness is the attempt to derive them from Scripture. We have no more to say upon this question than that we cannot accept Mr. Jowett's selection of the ideal and chance sayings of Scripture. To us, thank God, they are real utterances, corresponding to real truth, and rightly applied to the statement of sound opinions and doctrines.

Perhaps the weakest part of this Essay, however, is the illustration of the other aspect of this error, to wit, the supposed neglect or misinterpretation of words which are not equally in harmony with the spirit of the age. As an exposure of many instances in which the spirit of the meaning of Scripture has not been caught, or in which the letter has been unduly pressed, or in which an unreasonable application of the so-called 'counsels of perfection' has been made, nothing can be more beautiful than this section of the treatise. But to insinuate that this perversion of the meaning and use of scriptural language is chargeable upon the 'pre-supposition as to its origin' which is brought to the interpretation of it, is simply trifling with the subject. To say that this relation between the ideal precept and the actual world in which it is to be applied is one, the uncertainty of which must necessarily be a bar to any fixed and settled exposition, is an assertion which we protest against as utterly fallacious. It is true that many of our Saviour's precepts present to us an ideal which very few attain, and which the maxims and customs of the world will never allow the Christian public, as such, to exhibit. But what has that to do with the inspiration and Divine authority of those views? Does the essayist mean to say that the Lord's precepts concerning the blessedness of poverty, the renouncing all for His cause, the swearing not at all, the summoning the poor and maimed to our feasts, are such precepts as cannot be fairly dealt with and interpreted but by those who renounce all theories as to inspiration?

Passing in a very subtle manner from this indefinite line of argument, the essayist returns to his favourite theme,—the endless variety of meanings which have been fixed upon the words and statements of Scripture. Here almost every sentence contains some careful subtlety of insinuation which requires only to be twice read in order to its detection. It is not strictly true that 'when maintaining the Athanasian doctrine of the Trinity, we do not readily recall that verse, "Of that hour knoweth no man, no not the angels of God, *neither the Son*, but the Father."' The doctrine of the Holy Trinity has nothing to fear from any passage of the Bible. But, granting that in all the various controversies which have raged around the Millenarian, Calvinistic, Romanist, and other questions, a partisan feeling has made the 'favourite verses shine like stars, while the rest of the page is thrown into the shade,' what has that to do with the authority of Scripture, and the possibility of a uniform and consistent interpretation based upon a 'higher supernatural theory' of inspiration? It is undoubtedly true that in many points it is

hopeless to expect unanimity of opinion. But the diversity is grievously exaggerated, and the inference which is secretly drawn from it is a false one. Even granted that no two minds ever understood the Scripture alike, it would not be the less true that the Scripture might contain the infallible word of God.

Other questions besides that of inspiration are introduced by the essayist, as absolutely necessary to be settled before there can be any agreement on the interpretation of Scripture. And the upshot of the whole is, that as there never has been, so there never will be, a rational interpretation of the Bible until certain obstinate prejudices, common to all the Churches of Christendom, are given up. These prejudices and prepossessions are manifold: springing from an erroneous notion of the inspired origin of the Word of God, they cramp or mislead the interpreter at every point. They lead him to imagine that doctrines may be proved from Scripture; whereas its Eastern modes of thought and expression can never serve the purpose of demonstrating any complex system of doctrine or practice with philosophical precision. They lead him to regard the later uses of theological terms as applicable to their interpretation in the original; whereas all later suggestions of theology are valueless as helps to interpretation. They lead him to regard the Old Testament as containing types and symbols and predictions which have been accomplished in the New; whereas the Old and New Testaments are perfectly distinct, and when the New Testament quotes the Old, it only accommodates its words to the thoughts of another age. They lead him to regard the Word of God as pervaded by a unity which was never the design of Providence; and to vex the words, and figures, and uncertain grammatical terms of a decayed and ill-understood dialect, into conformity with foregone conclusions. Not till all these delusions are swept away will the Bible be understood. But when it shall come to pass that the Bible is interpreted like any other book, by the same rules of evidence and the same canons of criticism, 'its beauty will be freshly seen, as of a picture which is restored after many ages to its original state; it will create a new interest and make for itself a new kind of authority by the life which is in it.'

This 'return to nature' in the study of the sacred writings will issue in the establishment of certain fixed principles in the place of those which must be renounced. These principles, nakedly stated, are unexceptionable; but when the essayist expounds them, they are found to be as impracticable in themselves as they are derogatory to the glory of the Word of God.

First, *Scripture has one meaning*, that which it had to the mind that first received it. This, in a sense, is true; but let us mark what follows. It has, indeed, an 'inexhaustible or infinite character;' but nothing beyond what is seen on the surface must be attributed to the writer by his strict interpreter. There is no ground for assuming design of any other kind in Scripture than that which is found in Plato or Homer. Secondly, *Scripture must be interpreted from itself*, like any other book about which we know almost nothing except what is derived from its pages. But, let it be observed, each book for itself; there must be no violent harmonizing; the differences of authors and of ages must not be 'lost in the idea of a Spirit from whom they proceed, or by which they were overruled.' There is, indeed, a 'sort of continuity.' But the author shall explain what that is in a striking passage, which contains the pith of this whole destructive Essay. 'Such a general conception of growth or development in Scripture, beginning with the truth of the unity of God in the earliest books, and ending with the perfection of Christ, naturally springs up in our minds on the perusal of the sacred writings. It is a notion of value to the interpreter; for it enables him at the same time to grasp the whole and distinguish the parts. It saves him from the necessity of maintaining that the Old Testament is one and the same everywhere; that the books of Moses contain truths or precepts, such as the duty of prayer, or the faith in immortality, or the spiritual interpretation of sacrifice, which no one has ever seen there. It leaves him room enough to admit all the facts of the case. No longer is he required to defend or explain away David's imprecation against his enemies, or his injunctions to Solomon, any more than his sin in the matter of Uriah. Nor is he hampered with a theory of accommodation. Still the sense of "the increasing purpose which through the ages ran" is present to him, nowhere else continuously discernible or ending in a divine perfection. Nowhere else is there found the same interpenetration of the political and religious element—a whole nation, "though never good for much at any time," possessed with the conviction that it was living in the grace of God,—in whom the Sun of Righteousness shone upon the corruption of an Eastern nature,—the "fewest of all people," yet bearing the greatest part in the education of the world. Nowhere else among the teachers and benefactors of mankind is there any form like His, in whom the desire of the nation is fulfilled, and "not of that nation only," but of all mankind, whom He restores to His Father and their Father, to His God and their God.'

Our analysis up to this point has been hasty, but as correct as

may be. Our object, we frankly confess, has not been to do justice to the beauty and grace of the Essay: it must be read, and carefully read, to be understood and appreciated. We have served our own purpose in the summary which has been given,—that of making the Essay expose its own vague, hollow, and unsatisfactory principles. It is not an unfair exhibition of the general result, to say that, according to the principles of Mr. Jowett, Scripture must be dealt with like other books, without any reference to the Holy Spirit's part in its production, and His overruling care of its interpretation in the Church; without any respect to the doctrines which have been discovered in it, or grounded upon it, or proved by it, in the Church universal; without any recognition of the influence of the Divine Spirit, promised to the disciples of Christ, in ages that are past, and without any expectation of a supernatural guidance of our own minds, and suggestion to our own hearts. Our present purpose is served by simply stating this, and keeping silence.

The remainder of the Essay is occupied by two very suggestive, and, on the whole, very admirable, disquisitions upon the language of the New Testament, and the relation between strict interpretation and general adaptation of the language of the Bible. They are admirable, that is, as the careful composition of one who is a thorough scholar, and a careful and reverent reader of the Bible. But they converge to the same destructive point. The first leads to the conclusion that 'Christian truth is not dependent on the fixedness of modes of thought,' and that 'language, especially the language of Scripture, does not admit of any sharp distinction.' The second starts with the assumption that Scripture quotes itself in a manner not altogether in agreement with modern criticism; and leads to the twofold conclusion, first, that the applications which the New Testament makes of passages in the Old, are not to be insisted upon as their original meaning; and, secondly, that it gives authority and precedent for the use of similar applications in our own day. No amount of ingenuity and felicity of illustration—and both are exhibited here in perfection—can avail to neutralize the deadly influence of such a principle as this.

And then comes the conclusion—the application of the subject to theology and life. First, we have the stern and gloomy prophecy, that an altogether new principle of interpretation is demanded by the results of science and criticism; and, secondly, the question is asked, whether the signs of the times do not show that that prophecy is already being fulfilled. 'A veil was on the human understanding in the great contro-

versies which absorbed the Church in earlier ages; the cloud which the combatants themselves raised, intercepted the view. They did not see—they could not have imagined—that there was a world which lay beyond the range of the controversy.' But we have other lights; and 'in the present state of the human mind, any consideration of these subjects, whether from the highest, or lowest, or most moderate point of view, is unfavourable to the stability of dogmatical systems, because it rouses inquiry into the meaning of words.'

The writer spends his last sighs on the hope that the different sections of Christendom may meet on the common ground of the New Testament;—that the individual may be urged by the vacancy and unprofitableness of old traditions to make the Gospel his own,—a life of Christ in the soul, instead of a theory of Christ which is in a book or written down;—that in Missions to the Heathen, Scripture may become the expression of universal truths, rather than of the tenets of particular men or Churches;—that the study of Scripture may have a more important place in a liberal education than hitherto;—that the 'rational service' of interpreting Scripture may dry up the crude and dreamy vapours of religious excitement;—that in preaching, new sources of spiritual health may flow from a more natural use of Scripture;—and that the lessons of Scripture may have a nearer way to the hearts of the poor, when disengaged from theological formulas.

It is evidently with much distrust and consciousness of its unreality that this Professor of the English Church suggests the ideal of his hopes. He cannot, indeed, but know that the foundation of his whole system has in it no element of fixedness or stability. Many as are the difficulties which beset our old theories, they can after all give some account of themselves, and on the whole have done, and are doing, their work well in the world. But the difficulties of the ideal theory, which struggles in vain for expression in this Essay, are infinite and insuperable; and it can never become a power to move men, and carry on the work of the Gospel. The *Rule of Faith* which it propounds can never be reduced to language; it will not bear to be transferred from the subjective mind that holds it, or thinks it holds it, to the world of actual thought, and life, and work. We can in our charity suppose that a devout spirit, such as that of Mr. Jowett, and many others like-minded with him, educated on Christian principles, nourished by an earlier and truer faith, and continuing to apprehend Him, who is our Life, more simply and honestly with the heart than with the head, may go on its way of knowledge and holiness under the guidance of a revelation

dishonoured more in theory than practice. Such minds may unconsciously be guided in their pursuit of truth, and in their yearnings after holiness, by an implicit déference to inspired revelation, which secretly belies and vanquishes in their own souls all their vague and unsound hypotheses. But, granting this great and almost perilous concession, we must concede no more. Such a Bible, and such a theory of its authority and interpretation, as this theology presents, will not suffice to begin religion with, will not suffice for the setting out upon the way of life.

The entire theory *gives up too much* to be consistent with the retention of our common Christianity, and the Church which represents Christianity in the world; and it *retains too little* to resist the steady onward and downward course of latitudinarianism, scepticism, infidelity, and the darkness without. These two points we had intended to debate upon, but our limits are reached: they must be left to the reader's own reflection, and to our own better opportunity.

BRIEF LITERARY NOTICES.

Royal Academy of Arts. Catalogue of the Exhibition of Paintings Sculpture, and Architecture. 1860.—It is part of the paradox of English greatness, that our countrymen should so eminently excel in pursuits for which the nation is supposed to have no special genius. This singular phenomenon may be observed under many types of character and condition. Thus, in social life: the English are not distinguished as a polite people, but are commonly accounted of a rugged and intractable demeanour; yet, as the hardest stones are those which take the highest polish, so the loftiest ideal of courtesy has been realized by individuals of our race and country. So too in politics and government: nothing can be more blundering, imperfect, and anomalous, than English legislation in many of its earlier stages, and even in many of its constitutional forms; yet, as a whole, it bears the impress of high statesmanship and moral purpose, and though never so clumsy in attaining an object, we yet contrive to stumble into liberty and order.

But the best illustration of this peculiarity is furnished by the successful cultivation of the Fine Arts in this country. Our continental neighbours will be long before they grant that any artistic genius belongs to the sturdy English people. John Bull is a plain man of business, with no poetry or nonsense of that sort about him; our country is famous for its iron roads, and our admiration is reserved for heroes like the Iron Duke. But the fact remains unshaken, that the highest appreciation of musical genius is to be found in this metropolis; and there is no living school of painting to be compared with that of England. If any one doubt the last assertion, he may qualify himself for judging more correctly by a visit to the British Gallery at South Kensington. There are to be seen specimens of the produce of English Art during the one hundred years of its existence; but its most brilliant trophies belong to the last half century, three large rooms displaying the fertility and power of Turner's pencil, and conspicuous on the walls of the others, being the most triumphant efforts of Landseer, Leslie, Mulready, Webster, Etty, and MacIise.

But the productions of a single year afford perhaps a still fairer estimate of the existing state of the Arts, and a visit to the Exhibition of the Royal Academy proves it to be no less favourable. We cannot say here, as in the select and permanent gallery just referred to, 'There is hardly an inferior picture in the whole collection.' Nor would it be a reasonable thing to pass from the National Gallery, next door, where some of the choicest examples of the old masters make worthy company for each other, into these rooms, hung with paintings comparatively crude and indiscriminately gathered. But the spectator sees at once the large amount of activity and force, of faithful study, industry, and talent, which is now exercised and expended on this favourite art. Some striking works are this year exhibited by members of the Academy. The place of honour, at the top of the large room, is assigned to a picture by Sir Edwin Landseer. Visitors of every class will be glad to learn on such good evidence, that the powers of this distinguished artist have not yet sensibly, or at least materially, declined. Sir Edwin spreads this time a large canvass, and depicts the terrifying features of *A Flood in the Highlands*. There are proofs of intellectual power in this picture, but its execution is chalky, and the whole rather ill-defined. Altogether, the recent style of Sir Edwin seems to us inferior to that of the good old times of *Bolton Abbey*, or the glorious Dog days. By the way, why does he not produce an illustrated edition of *Æsop's Fables*? It would be the most natural thing in the world that his animals should speak,—that they should fawn, and strut, and cheat, and brag like any of their two-legged fellow-creatures. If the reader has been to South Kensington, he must have noticed two lank-eared hypocrites in drab who stand beside the tub of that droll dog, 'Diogenes': as to the bully who stands in his day-light, there is something quite human in the way in which he puts up with the cynical reproof.

A few other pictures we must only glance at. Mr. Philips has succeeded beyond expectation in his *Marriage of the Princess Royal*. It is very artistically grouped, and very brilliantly painted; the likenesses are for the most part good, and the bridesmaids altogether charming. In the right-hand side of the picture the eye is caught by the elaborate figure of the Princess Mary of Cambridge, on whom much pains and a *leetle* flattery have been well bestowed. The single contribution of Mr. Millais is already widely known, both by sight and by description. In size, character, and sentiment, *The Black Brunswicker* resembles that public favourite, *The Eve of St. Bartholomew*. In point of sentiment the resemblance is perhaps too close; for both illustrate the extremity of anxious love, in a moment of ominous separation. Considered by itself, the present is a marvellous piece of painting; so noble in conception, so true in character, so strict in tone and keeping, so firm and clear and pure in handling and execution. The male figure is a model of soldierly character and bearing, and the struggle with tender feelings is well indicated in the firm lines of his expressive face. There are two charming pictures by Mr. J. C. Hook,

whom we congratulate on his early attainment of Academic honours. To stand before one of these fine sea-pieces is as good as a visit to the coast; the air is blowing so fresh, the sailor boys are so hearty on their element, and the water is so 'darkly, deeply, beautifully blue.' The spectator feels himself to be in the coolest part of the room, though not by any means the least crowded.

We look with interest on the state and progress of English *portraiture*; for the position of any school must be greatly affected, if not really determined, by this noble branch of art, to which belong some of the best productions of the greatest masters. In the present exhibition there are a few portraits not unworthy of the school of Gainsborough and Reynolds. Those of Mr. J. P. Knight are certain to attract the observation of visitors. They are not perhaps of the highest order, but they are life-like and effective; his likeness of Mrs. Langley is painted with great breadth and force, while that of Sir H. Hoare is quite Rembrandtish in its tone and handling. There is strong individuality in these portraits, but it is that individuality which belongs to well-painted flesh and feature. More power of suggesting character is shown by Sir J. Watson Gordon, in the portraits of two of his countrymen, in which a certain Reynolds-like effect is obtained without the depth of colour which delights us in the works of that truly great master. Mr. F. Grant is spirited and clever, as usual, especially in a large equestrian portrait; and Mr. Richmond, in his likeness of Mrs. Hook, shows an advance of skill in union with his well-known grace and delicacy. Perhaps we may say, —Richmond for ladies, Grant for gentlemen, and Gordon for MEN. Mr. Knight, indeed, will give a bold and realistic likeness in any of these classes; and his portrait of Mr. Lane in last year's Exhibition proved that he can do justice to the finer qualities of head and face, when he is fortunate enough to have them before him. We would fain speak of Mr. G. F. Watts, whose order of merit in this branch of art is of the very highest; but neither of the pictures in the Academy Exhibition shows his powers to such advantage as his incomparable portrait of the Poet Laureate, lately to be seen elsewhere,—and that performance deserves a separate study and description. His family group of Mrs. C. Bentinck and children is very sweetly composed, and proves Mr. Watts to be a student of Raffaele. The 'Duke of Argyle' is an almost perfect likeness of that nobleman; but justice is hardly done to the fine quality and flowing character of his cinnamon-coloured hair. We may add, in conclusion, that Mr. Gush exhibits a well-painted full-length of Sir William Fenwick Williams of Kars, who seems to have done nothing but stand for his portrait, to one artist or another, since his return to this country. On the next occasion we hope, for his own sake, that the gallant hero will be seated.

Etchings, from the Sketch-Book of an Artist. By James Smetham. Nos. I., II., and III. It is easy to recognise the claims of crowned and honoured genius; but true taste and patronage will always anticipate

the public award, and generally direct and hasten it. Mr. Smetham is not a novice in art; for he has been a deep and ardent student for many years; but he made his acquisitions in a retired and peculiar manner, and now proposes to give some of the results of systematic study to the public. The present series of designs, etched by himself, are very clever and original, and we are glad to learn that they are attracting a fair share of attention. The etchings are issued quarterly, at a very moderate price.

Autobiographical Recollections and Correspondence of Robert Charles Leslie. Edited by Tom Taylor, Esq. Two Vols. London: 1860.—We must content ourselves with bringing this delightful book to the reader's notice; for the time now at our disposal will barely serve to indicate its contents and general character. Few readers need to be told that the autobiographer was a favourite artist of the English school. Mr. Leslie was born of American parents, and spent most of his boyhood in the city of Philadelphia; but his birth, his taste, his habits, and his preferences were all English. His progress in art was slow, and his feeling for colour not eminently strong; but he had a refined sense of humour and certain grace of treatment which made him a charming annotator of Shakspeare and Cervantes and Molière, of Addison and Goldsmith and Fielding. He was fortunate enough to find one of the most generous of patrons in the Earl of Egremont, whose personal kindness to the artist and his family amounted to real friendship. For that nobleman he painted his well-known picture of 'Sancho Panza in the Apartment of the Duchess.' A repetition of this picture, painted for Mr. Vernon, is now in the National Collection; and a second repetition, presented to the artist's sister, has passed into the gallery of Mr. Farnworth, of Liverpool. Another celebrated performance of Mr. Leslie was his Coronation picture, commissioned by Her Majesty the Queen. The Introduction to the present volumes contains a critical estimate of the artist's works, by Mr. Tom Taylor, whose connoisseurship is for the most part sound and good. The autobiography forms the remainder of the first volume, and the correspondence occupies the second. We recommend the work as a holiday and sea-side companion. It is the most charming production of the season, and shows a graceful artist in the interesting relations of family life, and under the cheerful influence of Christian hopes.

Three Hundred Sonnets. By Martin F. Tupper, D.C.L., F.R.S. London. 1860.—Poetry is the wine of literature: we expect it to be rare, but we may insist that it be good. But poetry in the form of sonnets invites attention as something peculiarly select in quality—as thought most carefully distilled, and then scrupulously measured into crystal verse. The sonnets of the Italian poets answer purely to this description, especially the tender compositions of Petrarch and the sublime effusions of Filicaja. These have besides a sweetness and melody that no harsher language than that of Italy affords. The great English master of the sonnet is Wordsworth, who has left many hundred models distinguished by the dignity and strength of genius; not

a few of them are cameos of perfect beauty. But perhaps the sonnets of Mrs. Browning are to be preferred, as equal in point of elegance, and far more tender; for this form of composition requires a certain tenderness of sentiment to modify the harshness of its brevity, and to keep it from degenerating into naked epigram. Some of our readers will remember the sonnet on Peter's denial of our Lord, entitled 'The Meaning of the Look;' with its bare simplicity of language, its harmony of tone, and its final culminating weight of thought, it is an absolutely perfect specimen. Still more remarkable, as a sustained and varied effort, is the series denominated 'From the Portuguese,' by the same gifted lady; for it is easily to be discerned that the title is a mere fancy, and that these exquisite love poems were born into our own English tongue. They are among the choicest productions of Mrs. Browning's genius.

Tried by the standard of these high examples, the Sonnets of Mr. Tupper certainly come short. They want the rarer and finer qualities that we look for; the organic beauty, the efflorescent grace, which distinguish every perfect rose of thought. Yet many of them are admirable compositions of the second order. They embody noble sentiments in pure and noble language, and sometimes the expression is felicitous as well as true. The series comprises a very wide range of subjects, public and domestic, moral and loyal, social and historical. They appear to have been written long ago, as the several occasions rose; yet most of the sonnets bear the marks of haste, at least they lack that finish which the opportunity of revision usually secures. Mr. Tupper has none of that artistic feeling which led Cardinal Bembo, in the preparation of his sonnets and canzoni, to pass each through the forty compartments of his desk, bestowing some improvement at every stage of its advance. Neither is he sufficiently select in his choice of topics, the prosaic character of which frequently re-acts upon the style, making the whole composition coarse and harsh. An occasional display of egotism is another drawback to the reader's pleasure; and it is this which has probably made some of our critical brethren bear hard upon the works of Mr. Tupper. We have no wish to qualify our praise by further strictures. It is pleasanter to observe that the core of these sonnets is generally sound and firm. All that the author writes is distinguished by a love of independence, truth, and piety. The following, on 'The Gold-diggings,' is an average example of his style and sentiment:—

'Behold a miracle!—when Mercy found
That still in vain across the watery wide
Famine and Plenty to each other cried,
Pleading for food or feasters all around,
God gave the word! and straight with lumps of gold,
And brilliant specks among the rich black mould,
Some angel sowed the labour-craving ground;
And so the shoaling multitudes went forth,
Pour'd from this hive of nations in the north
To people our Antipodes: O man!

When shall thy dullard soul acknowledge God,
 Wondrous in perfecting as wise in plan,—
 Thus leading on Progression's eager van
 By the poor fisher's line, a baited sod?

It is probable that this volume of Sonnets will add little or nothing to Mr. Tupper's reputation. We should like to whisper to the author that he writes too often and prints too much. It seems to us that his 'Proverbial Philosophy' is the only production of his pen which has sufficient force and merit to sustain his influence in the world, and to keep his name in remembrance. It will rather favour than disserve him if oblivion should quietly overtake the rest.

Commentary on the Pentateuch. Translated from the German of Otto von Gerlach. By the Rev. Henry Downing, Incumbent of St. Mary's, Kingswinford. T. and T. Clark. 1860.—The biblical literature of England is not rich in illustrations of the Pentateuch; the work of Ainsworth, now two centuries old, being still the most valuable on that part of Scripture. Meantime our German neighbours have paid great attention to the exegesis of the Old Testament, and especially of the Books of Moses. The present work may be reckoned among the latest and the best upon the subject. It is popular in character and strictly orthodox in theory and interpretation. The author's plan of publication excludes the sacred text, retaining only the particular sentence or phrase which is to receive elucidation and remark. This brings the work within the limits of a single volume, and determines it to be chiefly a book of reference. Considering its German authorship, it is remarkably free from all the outward signs of learning. When a Hebrew word is given, it is printed in the English character; but the author generally contents himself with a literal rendering of the term. On every page we have the fruits of genuine erudition, without any of its tedious affectation and parade.

The Annotated Paragraph Bible: containing the Old and New Testaments according to the Authorized Version, arranged in Paragraphs and Parallelisms; with Explanatory Notes. London: Religious Tract Society. 1860.—This admirable edition of Holy Scripture is now brought to a conclusion, and may be obtained in one substantial volume, or in three of moderate and convenient size. We do not know that a more useful or more creditable publication of the kind has been issued, even by the Society whose name it bears. It is first distinguished by a division of the sacred text into paragraphs. Such an arrangement is not, of course, new to the student of Scripture; but we hail the prospect of its wider adoption; for though a mere typographical improvement, it is of real importance to the general reader. The arbitrary division into verses, now so familiar, has no doubt been of great service and convenience. Among other uses it has shown that the Word of God, like His material works, will bear the closest microscopic inspection. What classic, ancient or modern, and especially what large series of diversified writings, will bear such analysis and scrutiny clause by clause? But if the Scrip-

tures have gained in authority and reverence by passing triumphantly through so severe a test, it must be owned that advantage of another kind has been surrendered in the process. Much of the force of argument, and perhaps still more of the connected beauty of narrative, has been weakened or destroyed by what is frequently a harsh dismemberment of sacred texts. For want of paragraphs, grouping the several incidents, injunctions, and discourses, the eye has rendered no assistance to the understanding; in many instances the reader has been partially at fault, if not positively misled; and even expounders of Scripture have been too apt to interpret an isolated clause without sufficient heed to its relative position. These dangers are removed by a more logical division of the text, as here adopted; and the result is also seen in the fresh interest and beauty imparted to the sacred and familiar records. This effect is perhaps most marked in the poetical books of the Old Testament. How many read and repeat the Psalms with only a dim and casual appreciation of their meaning! Perhaps none but a thorough student enters into it; but when the English text is printed in parallels, the significance and weight, as well as the spirit and tenor of the whole, is much enhanced to the common reader. So, too, in the writings of the Prophets. When the sublime odes of Ezekiel and Isaiah are duly meted into lyrical divisions, and the Lamentations of Jeremiah presented in their proper form as elegies, the mind is prepared for the mood and utterance of prophetic inspiration; then the boldness of the figures and the beauty of the correspondencies are at once perceived, and oriental metaphor and hyperbole appreciated according to the spirit rather than the letter.

But, perhaps we have dwelt too long on the mere arrangement of the text. It is the body of annotations which confer the chief distinction on this Bible. Every book is prefaced by a brief but lucid introduction; and explanatory notes keep pace with the text throughout. Utility in the widest sense is the object which the Editors have kept in view. Obscure idioms and allusions are skilfully elucidated; one scripture is made to throw its light upon another, and imperfect renderings of the original text are pointed out and repaired. It is probable that many readers will be struck by the number of passages calling for more or less amendment; we think they will be equally surprised and gratified by the substituted words and phrases. The new readings suggested are so free from every speculation and party bias, and so distinguished by accuracy, taste, and judgment, that for our own part we would be well content to leave the proposed revision of the authorized text to the editors of this *Annotated Paragraph Bible*. The work would certainly be performed in the most catholic and faithful spirit.

The Prophet of Nazareth: or, The one Story of the Four Gospels. With Preface by the Rev. J. C. Miller, D.D. C. Knight. 1860.—This little book resembles the much larger one just noticed. It is a presentation of sacred Scripture under a new typographical arrangement,—in this case, of the Gospel according to the four Evangelists,

their several records being joined to form a connected Life of Christ. The whole of the wondrous narrative lies in little compass, is not much larger than the *Phædo* of Plato or the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon. But the Divine wisdom and benevolence of the Master, with all the miraculous features of His life and death, are only here more strikingly seen on every page, and show all the loftier from the homely simplicity of the relation. We must put it side by side with the best of human compositions, and read incident for incident and precept for precept, to be more than ever persuaded that the difference is one of kind, not simply of degree. The Gospels are skilfully connected by the present harmonist; and we commend his little volume to all our readers.

Histoire des Protestants et des Eglises Réformées du Poitou. Par Auguste Liéuze, Pasteur. Tomes I. et II. Paris: Grassart. 1856, 1858.—These volumes are an interesting contribution to the history of Protestantism; a third portion, which is promised shortly, will conclude the work; and we are sure that those of our readers who feel an interest in the share taken by France in the Reformation will thank us for directing their attention to this and the other publications of the French Protestant Historical Society which issue from the same press. Notwithstanding the writings of D'Aubigné, Weiss, and Felice, we question whether the hold which the Reformation had once gained on the French nation has been generally appreciated: nor is this astonishing. Crushed by the cruelties of the dragonnades, deprived of all civil rights, and welcomed gladly by neighbouring states holding a like creed, Protestantism for a time disappeared, at least from the surface of French history. And although at the Revolution religious liberty was declared to be the right of every Frenchman, yet the indifference of the mass of the people, the powerful opposition of the Romish priesthood, and the unfriendly attitude of successive governments, alike jealous of Protestant liberty of thought, and eager for the support of the Popish party, combined to exercise an unfavourable influence, the effects of which are still severely felt. The testimony of the past, however, the rapid spread of their principles, the behaviour of their supporters, and the manner in which they were suppressed,—all this is strongly in favour of the Reformed. We regard the work before us as an appeal to this testimony.

M. Liéuze has mainly gathered his materials from unedited papers in the provincial libraries of Poitou. He has bestowed much pains in the selection of authentic documents, and is evidently more careful to speak the truth than to advance his own party. The excesses of the first Reformed bodies are faithfully, though mournfully, detailed. Indeed, it was a sorrowful time. The evils of civil war were envenomed by the *odium theologicum*. Treachery and massacre provoked reprisals which might have been interminable, had not a true Christian spirit animated some of the Reformed leaders.

An interesting feature of these volumes is the account of the early rise and spread of the movement. As in Germany, Switzerland, and

England, the ablest of its early advocates were found in the ranks of the Romish clergy. We must refer our readers to the book for particulars. Then came opposition and persecution, with its usual result of strengthening the persecuted in their belief. In small bands, in private houses or in forests and caves, at midnight or ere daybreak, the faithful assembled; no danger too great, no inconvenience too annoying, to keep them from hearing that truth preached which their hearts had learned to prize. It is only in studying such details (and they are hardly possible save in a restricted provincial history) that we realize the discouragements by which the faith of God's people has been so often tried. Then we see how in every age its effects have been the same,—how the true metal rings again, when tested, as in the first ages of the Church,—how the truth, when faithfully presented, has the same power as of old to possess the heart and influence the life. We have thus in these pages a vivid picture of the condition of the first converts: one feature, indeed, is wanting; (whether from lack of materials for its construction or no, we cannot say; but) whilst we learn the outward life of the Church, the changes in its social condition, the appointments of its pastors and so on, we have none of the individual inner Christian life of the period, and this it is with which we feel most desire to become acquainted.

The second book comprises the wars of religion, and the inner life of the Church during those troubles. Its faith shone in the fires; but as the party grew in strength, it fell under the guidance of political leaders. Great hopes were entertained when Henri Quatre ascended the throne; but political power did not amalgamate well with its religious influence; and the third book, which extends from the publication of the Edict of Nantes to the fall of La Rochelle, is the history of only thirty years. Richelieu has the credit of caring only to exalt the royal prerogative, and of leaving the Protestants the full exercise of their faith: but M. Liéuze's fourth book details the petty persecutions to which they were subject. Churches were dispersed, temples demolished, assemblies forbidden in different parts of Poitou. At every respite accorded to the Reformed the wrath of the Popish clergy waxed loud and high. Notwithstanding every species of annoyance, the Protestants increased in wealth; but this only made them, defenceless as they were, a more desirable sport. According to our author, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes was but the crowning act of a long series of vexations which had gradually paved the way to its accomplishment. As is usual, the edicts of persecution were filled with expressions of concern for their victims. The hymnas of Rome always cry over it as they devour the prey.

We are strongly tempted to linger over the last part of this work: but we must forbear. The effect of the dragonnades, (in one instance fifteen hundred were converted in a single night,) the insincerity and self-reproaches of many that yielded to force, the treatment by the Churches of the relapsed, the wholesale emigration of the party, and the undying adherence of a faithful few that remained behind, are

not a new story to us, but one which we can dwell on again and again. To many the last book—*Les Assemblées au Désert*—will seem the most interesting of all, and it gains rather than loses by its strictly local colouring. The whole work, of course, does not profess to be a complete history of French Protestantism. But to those who care to study the past in its inner details, and thus more truly to catch its spirit, to those who would form a juster conception of the condition of the struggling Church than can be gained from a merely general and comprehensive view, and to those who consider the force of truth in any age and under any circumstances the most deeply interesting subject of inquiry, we can with confidence recommend the volumes of M. Liéuze.

Hermann and Dorothea. Translated by the Rev. Henry Dale, M.A. Rector of Wilby, and British Chaplain at Dresden. Dresden: H. M. Gottschalk.—*Hermann and Dorothea* is unquestionably one of the most remarkable productions of German literature. In no poem we know is the art which conceals art more perfect and effective. It is the simplest story of German country life, and rests chiefly on the truth and tenderness of its description. One shade beyond it the Real in poetry cannot possibly go; and yet the author's own *Iphigenia*, with all its marble purity and beauty, is scarcely more truly poetic. With the exception perhaps of that *Iphigenia*, it is almost the only one of Goethe's great works to whose whole spirit, tone, and expression, neither justice nor prejudice can possibly take exception. As much of true poetic inspiration as ever shone upon Corydons, or Neëras, or Amintas, or Faithful Shepherds, is blended here with that tenderness and delicate purity which so many celebrated pastorals wanted, and with that simple nature and naïve truthfulness in which nearly all pastorals are deficient. It is thoroughly German in its external characteristics, in its home touches, and its hints of manner. Every scrap of description, every scene and incident, every allusion and association, are German to the very heart. But the German human beings whose brief story and unpretending characters compose the life of it, are so thoroughly of kin to us all by the ties of ordinary human nature and human feeling, that the English reader must admit them to an instant and a cordial intimacy. The entire action of the poem passes between noon and night. The glow of a mid-day sun shines upon its first scene, and the over-shadowed moon and sudden thunderstorm of the night mark its close. It is a momentary glimpse amid the terror and confusion which the French Revolution spread across the Rhine into one little German homestead, and one quiet tale of sudden love, crossed only for a few hours, and then successful and happy. An old innkeeper, with his wife and son, a country vicar, a village apothecary, and a true-hearted quick-handed maiden form the persons of the poem. Its power is of that half-suppressed kind which it was the felicity of Goethe's style to employ. Everything is suggested, nothing exhausted. Exquisite gleams of human feeling; vivid and almost magical glimpses into human hearts, and

motives, and humours; a scattered line or two of picturesque description here and there, lighting up a whole landscape like a sunbeam; components such as these, developed and combined with an art which no critical analysis can describe, make up this most beautiful and most truthful of modern idyls.

Such a poem as this might be readily expected to win a prompt welcome among English readers. It is, unfortunately for those unacquainted with German, one which deters and embarrasses English translators as much probably as any other known to modern literature. There is even *in limine* a serious obstacle. The metre of *Hermann and Dorothea* is the hexameter to which most English readers feel, and English critics express, a very decided—although, we cannot help thinking, unreasonable—aversion, when adopted in English verse. To render the poem into any other metre would necessarily wash away so much of its character and form—and readers of Goethe know how much any of his poems would lose in losing its form—that to any one who had ever seen the original, it would be scarcely recognisable. But there are other difficulties as well. So much of the charm of *Hermann and Dorothea* lurks in the exquisite union of force and simplicity which its language embodies, that it is scarcely possible to conceive of its passing through any commutation without losing much that was precious in the process. Thus far, therefore, although one of the triumphs of German literature, and the master-effort of a certain kind of poetic art, it has been caviare to the translator, and a large number of English readers can only catch of it just the reflected brightness which shines through Mr. Longfellow's *Evangeline*.

The little volume before us is a translation—the first metrical translation we have seen—of *Hermann and Dorothea*. The translator, the Rev. Henry Dale, has confronted the first difficulty of his task manfully, and decided judiciously. He has had the courage to adhere to the measure of the original. There is, indeed, but a choice of dangers; and we feel satisfied that no version in any other measure will ever find a standard place among English literature. We do not, moreover, believe it by any means impossible to reconcile English readers to the hexameter in poems to which that measure is adapted. It is not an English measure; but we have all through the course of our literature been adopting with success measures which were not English. Longfellow's *Evangeline* is a striking specimen of what may be done, and the poem of *Miles Standish* a still more recent instance of success.

Mr. Dale unfolds the poet's story, sets his personages before us, and renders justice to the meaning of his thoughts, and the outlines of his picture. In doing even this much, he has rendered service, and given pleasure, to many English readers. But the translation, after all, is only in the language which Monsieur Jourdain spake,—it is nothing but prose. To break up a passage into a certain number of lines of certain lengths does not make poetry. Nor is even the merely

mechanical portion of the verse always very skilfully mastered. The hexameter must scarcely be judged of by this specimen, many of the lines of which it seems impossible to distinguish from very hard and unmusical prose. This line for instance:—

'Nor in the eyes of the girls dost thou wish to shine in regimentals.'

Or this:—

'And a smaller one—thus she walked to the well, full of business.'

What skill of reading can make poetry of,—

'And from the strong smelling kale, picked a few caterpillars in passing?'

Can any ingenuity of elocution preserve at once the sense and the rhythm of such a line as the following:—

'Entered the men's room, which first she had left with anxiety, speaking?'

When did Goethe ever write a line like this?—

'Flashing lightning, and soon will extinguish the full moon so lovely.'

Colloquial Anglicisms too had better, in such a poem, be wholly avoided. 'The driver on the dickey,' or, 'Wooing for others is ticklish,' might be tolerable in a newspaper paragraph, or allowable in ordinary conversation, but scarcely harmonize with the simple, German style of a poem, whose German simplicity is one of its leading charms. The poem is to be made intelligible to English readers, and melodious to English ears, but is not to be converted into a downright English poem or, at all events, into English colloquial prose.

It is only just to acknowledge that, with the exception of such points as these, there are not many distinct faults to be found with the little volume before us. Mr. Dale is evidently a thorough German scholar; and, in this essential qualification, contrasts very favourably with some more popular translators of Goethe's verse. But he scarcely seems to have much of the poetic in him; and he could not possibly have selected a subject which more imperatively required a delicate poetic treatment. The charm which distinguishes poetry from the very finest and highest prose, is wholly wanting in this translation. A hard, roughly-beaten hexameter line is all that denotes even the presentment of a poem. The faults of the version are, for the most part, negative. The defect is not that this or that passage is badly rendered, but that there is a total absence of grace and beauty throughout the whole. Goethe leaves a translator very little room to stray in. He has so little of the rhetorical, so little of the efflorescent, and yet such an intense power of suggestive expression, that what might pass for a reasonably good version of another poet, is intolerable with regard to him. The best elements of poetry and prose, of the language of the real and that of the ideal, are so wonderfully blended in *Hermann and Dorothea*, that only a very appreciative and skilful touch can reproduce the combination. Nevertheless, this is the task to be performed; and anything short of it is a failure. In a certain condition of the atmosphere, the lines of sea and sky, the

palpable and the impalpable, touch with so delicate a shading, that even the painter's quick eye cannot readily distinguish each from each. But the artist who attempts to depict such a scene, must reproduce the almost imperceptible distinction: if the outline be broadly distinct, or be absolutely indistinguishable, the work so far is a failure. Something of this difficult kind Mr. Dale undertook when he attempted the task of this translation. It is no great discredit that he has not succeeded; but the work must be pronounced a failure.

This version is, however, for the most part clear and intelligible; and even through its medium no reader can fail to be struck with the singular combination of powers which the poet put to use within so small a compass. The living pictures it encloses are marvellous in their faithful clearness. With all its tenderness and beauty, *Evangeline* is but a colourless and lifeless shadow, so far as human reality is concerned, of the German groupings of *Hermann and Dorothea*. That surprising power of exhibiting a whole scene or a whole character in a few lines, which Goethe so possessed, and so prized, is conspicuous in its every page. The host of the Golden Lion, with his whimsies, and his temper, and his common, worldly sense, might have been known by any of us. Of an entirely different kind of whimsicality is the old bachelor apothecary, or 'druggist,' as Mr. Dale terms him; abandoning the longer word for the reason which compelled Horace to omit the name of a certain tower in his celebrated description of his excursion, because it could not be brought into hexameter. There is something like the hand of Goldsmith in the portrait of the mild and accomplished vicar:—

'He the pride of the town; still young in his earliest manhood—
He was acquainted with life, and knew the wants of his hearers;
Thoroughly was he impressed with the value supreme of the Scriptures
Which man's destiny to him reveal, and what feelings best suit it,
While he was also well versed in the best of secular writings.'

German landscape scenery was never more vividly and gracefully described, German country life never more winningly illustrated, than in this little poem. In many passages, indeed, may something of the touching, homely charm of Goldsmith be suggested; and who does not know how fondly in the boyish days of Strasburg and Leipzig Goethe hung over the works of Goldsmith, and appreciated them to the fullest? The poem is remarkable too because it emits one or two of these flashes of patriotic and national feeling which issued from Goethe so rarely. The grouping and life-painting of *Hermann and Dorothea* are as fresh to-day as they were half a century ago. Are there not passages too which the Germans of the present day might speak with energy and warning force?

'He in whose head is no sense in these days will take little trouble,
And give what is good for himself and the land of his fathers.
What I had seen and heard to-day filled my heart with disquiet;
And then I came up here and saw the glorious landscape,
Spreading afar, and winding around us with fruit-bearing uplands;
Saw too the golden fruit bowing down as if for the reaping,

Full of promise to us of rich harvest and garner replenished.
 O, but, alas! how near is the foe! The Rhine's flowing channel
 Is, to be sure, our guard: yet now what are channels and mountains
 To that terrible people which comes on thence like a tempest?
 For they are calling together on every border the young men,
 Ay, and the old, and onward are urging with might, and the masses
 Shun not the face of death, but masses still press upon masses,
 And does a German, alas! in his house still venture to linger?
 Hopes he forsooth alone to escape the all-menacing ruin?
 Truly, were but the might of our German youth all together
 On the borders, and leagued not an inch to yield to the stranger,
 O, they should not be allowed to set foot on our glorious country,
 And before our eyes consume our land's fruitful produce,
 Lay their commands on our men, and rob our wives and our maidens.'

The above is an average specimen of Mr. Dale's translation, and from it the reader may judge the texture of the whole.

A Compendium of Biblical Criticism on the Canonical Books of the Holy Scriptures. By Frederick Sargent. London: Longmans. 1860.—Our readers may be dull enough to wonder what the title of this book may mean. They will be thankful, therefore, to learn that the author has himself expounded it. 'Biblical Criticism,' he tells us, 'must be estimated in its twofold province of ascertaining the genuineness of the inspired text itself, whether the Hebrew or the Greek, and that of revising a faithful and literal transcript of the same into our Anglo-Saxon tongue.' 'The former,' which he takes to be 'of the first importance, and of the most difficult research,' has been, 'in a great measure,' he states, 'overcome by the assiduity of those who have been pioneers in the clearance of obstacles, and have laid bare valuable tracts of metalliferous veins. The latter has been very successfully and essentially achieved by the translators of James I., in their edition of 1611.' 'The progress of dormant knowledge,' however, and other considerations, make it very desirable, in the writer's judgment, that the Authorized Version should, as speedily as possible, undergo a careful and thorough revision. It is true Dr. Townsend has given us a chronological arrangement of Scripture in the words of our Version. 'There have been likewise numerous Harmonies of the New Testament. Criticisms have been written,' too, 'on detached books of the Hebrew text; and that of the Greek Testament has been sifted by German bibliographers.' But the time is come when something more should be done. 'What is required is a more concise adjustment of parts and digest of the whole; a more judicious reconciliation of differential opinions, and attainable certitude of dubitative conclusions.' To assist in promoting this object, the Author has 'selected and arranged, without any querulous desire of finding fault, and with impartial honesty,' what he deems the principal emendations of the original, and corrigenda of our native version, either having a doctrinal and practical bearing, relating to facts, names, and dates, which present apparent incongruities, or being ambiguous passages, which need further explanation on account of their obscurity.' And in the produce of the 'wide field' and 'fertile

arborescent,' which thus spread themselves before the knife and sickle of the writer, we have the work, the title of which is, we trust, by this time sufficiently clear to our readers. We are indebted for the light we have been able to shed on this obscure subject to an 'Introduction,' in which Mr. Sargent has been good enough to pave the way to the substance of his book. It is many a long day since we met with anything to equal the self-complacent dogmatism, the magnificent pedantry, and the richly comical grandiloquence of this same Introduction. It begins with talking about the '*vivâ-voce* revelation,' which the Deity gave to man in the beginning, and the 'palatal, guttural, and labial organization' of the mouth of Adam and the patriarchs. After this comes a string of passages on anthropomorphism, the confusion of tongues, the value of books, and the spread of knowledge by steam and electricity. A speech on the Press follows, to which we beg to call Lord Brougham's attention, as one of the latest specimens of that 'Attic oratory,' the cultivation of which he was commending the other day to the University of Edinburgh. Our readers must be satisfied with hearing that the Press is 'a gigantic instrumentality of moral good, with its train of inflammable evil; that it is 'an absolutism and monopoly, which can only be dethroned and eschewed by competition, being both the dictator and judge of its fellow-man, the trumpeter and libeller of fame;' and that it is 'the insatiable horseleech of Solomon, and a perpetual motion, whose speed is commensurate with time.' We are not at the end when this is over. How a man in the nineteenth century can hope to be heard on the subject of Biblical Criticism, who tells us, that the Bible 'takes an unique precedence before all books on the shelf of every library, both as being anomalously the most antique, and yet inexhaustibly new;' and that it is 'the interlocutor of the infant, so soon as it can lisp its own name, and the sapience of the hoary head, before descending into the grave;' we are more at a loss to imagine than we can find words to express.

Notwithstanding this laughable Introduction, the body of Mr. Sargent's book is not without its merits. It consists of more than four hundred pages of critical observations on various passages of the Old and New Testament, the original text of which seems to call for amendment, or the meaning of which is thought to be misrepresented or inadequately pictured in the Authorized Version: and as the design of the work is good, so the execution of it is really better than the flourishes which usher it in might lead us to suppose. We can imagine readers of Scripture, who would be assisted by the information it conveys. It exhibits everywhere marks of the industry and conscientiousness of the writer. Now and again there are traces in it of a strength of mind and soundness of judgment, which other parts of his performance do not substantiate. As a whole we are bound to pronounce that the work is defective, ill-proportioned, feeble, and all but worthless. The authorities on which it builds are not unfrequently superannuated; still often they are weak and untrustworthy.

Comparatively little use is made of modern research and scholarship. Sufficient care has not been taken in selecting the passages which form the subject of the author's annotations. They are at once too numerous and too few. Many most important texts are altogether excluded, while others are introduced which might very well have been passed over. Almost everywhere, too, the relative critical rank of the passages has been lost sight of. Thus, for example, a page and a half are devoted to Genesis ix. 25: 'Cursed be Canaan,' &c.; while 1 John v. 5 is dismissed in a few lines. And this remark applies to whole books, as well as to single texts. In illustration of this it will suffice to state, that Daniel has more space allotted to it than either Job or the Psalms; that the Proverbs and Canticles are each disposed of in half a page; that the notes on Ezra and Nehemiah are as large as on all the Minor Prophets together; and that the Epistle to the Romans is dealt with in less than a quarter of the room occupied by an imperfect catalogue of the various readings of the Apocalypse. With regard to the quality of the criticism itself, we feel compelled to say, that it is as meagre, shallow, and puerile as the most zealous opponent of a revision of our Version could desire. Here and there, indeed, you stumble upon a creditable passage; but these are exceptional cases; and the spell of a master never falls upon you from one end of the book to the other. Even the solid mass of it is disfigured by the whimsicalities, absurdities, and lilliputianisms which are so rife in the Introduction. In one place, for instance, we are told, that but for a change which the author adopts, 'the whole passage, with its context, would only be an incongruous incident, and eclogue of pastoral imagination.' In another, 'the Romish adoration of the cross' is characterized as 'the stultification of impiety.' Under Acts xxiii. 5. it is said of the Pope, that he 'pre-eminently proclaims himself to be the radical cause, vitiated centre, and reprobate finale of unnatural and necessitated rebellion against his own illegitimate power.' Elsewhere we are taught, that 'a sacred concert performed in the temple' at Jerusalem 'was grand and impressive;' and that, 'if we judge from the effects produced by the powers of music, there must have been such native vocalists and performers' among the Hebrews 'as a Jenny Lind or a Picco.' James Montgomery and his *World before the Flood*, Temple Bar and its spiked heads, organs in Dissenting chapels, and Sol-fa-re associations, Tractarianism, and the physiology of the Resurrection, all troop before us in turn in this strange phantasmagoria. It is a medley of foolish and impertinent remarks, the very opposite of all that is pure in scholarship and sound in judgment.

Unity in Variety, as deduced from the Vegetable Kingdom: being an Attempt at developing that Oneness which is discernible in the Habits, Mode of Growth, and Principle of Construction of all Plants. By Christopher Dresser, Lecturer on Botany, &c. London. 1859.—This interesting book reminds us of the present tendency of science. The wonderful diversity of nature has been the theme of admiration in

every age, and the poet and the artist have turned it to rich account. But modern research has given a novel aspect to this diversity, by tracing natural forms to their primitive types, and by revealing the analogies which unite the several orders of the organic world. It is now seen and acknowledged that these works of the Creator are most eminently distinguished by the strictest economy of principle in connexion with the largest variety of results. In the *Typical Forms* of Dr. Mc'Cosh and Dr. Dickie we had a wide exhibition of this truth, and a powerful application of it to the conclusions of natural theology. In the work before us, Dr. Dresser turns his attention to his favourite study, the beautiful science of Botany, and shows how simple and how few are the types on which the several parts and innumerable varieties of plants are based. The inquiry is very skilfully conducted, and the whole elucidated and enriched with many illustrations. The book forms a handsome companion to the author's *Rudiments of Botany*, which is the latest and best introduction to the science.

History of the Christian Church to the Reformation. From the German of Professor Kurtz. With Emendations and Additions, by the Rev. Alfred Edersheim, Ph.D. T. and T. Clark.—It would be difficult to speak too highly of this valuable work, or to overrate the learning, judgment, and skill which have concurred in its production. Considered as a general map of Church history, it is all that can be desired, and much more than is commonly expected or received. Such manuals are apt to be confusing, dry, unsatisfactory, and almost useless; but the work of Professor Kurtz is the reverse of this description. Nothing could be more comprehensive than its plan, nothing more careful than its details; while the freshness of style and piety of tone give to it a personal charm which is quite wanting in all other tabular arrangements of historic facts. With this learned guide we follow the spread of Christian truth into every land, and trace its development of growth under all conditions; we see Gospel principles and missionary zeal striving against opposition and corruption, by turns checked, and modified, and re-asserted; sometimes in liturgy and hymn and creed maintaining a pure faith, but more frequently distorted and debased by worse than heathen superstitions. Nothing seems to be omitted in this admirable compendium. The chief controversies, confessions, heresies, and schisms of the early Church, the influence of the scholastic philosophy, and the rise of the religious orders, are all briefly but judiciously related; and under some of these heads we have a statement of great interest, or a portraiture of real beauty. The editor has well performed his duty to the English reader.

An Exposition of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. By Charles Hodge, D.D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. London: Nisbet. 1860.—An interesting and useful volume. The exposition of Dr. Hodge is not distinguished by any great breadth of view; but it has the merit of being careful, minute, and painstaking. The theology is Calvinistic, without disguise; which, of course, hampers the exposition in certain places. For ex-

ample, on chapter vi. 1: 'We beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain;' we are told that it is impossible 'that those who have once made their peace with God, and experienced His renewing grace, can fall away unto perdition;' and that the phrase, 'the grace of God,' does not here mean the actual forgiveness of sin, but the infinite favour of having made His Son an offering for us; which gracious offer they were not to allow to be in vain as it regarded themselves. But this interpretation forgets one of the principal terms of the passage. If 'the grace of God' here means, as Dr. Hodge says, the favour of God as shown in the gift of Jesus Christ, then to *receive* that grace must mean to accept of Christ, to receive Him by faith for ourselves; and it is this *receiving* of Christ which the apostle specially refers to, and contemplates the possibility of its being after all 'in vain,' in the case of some of the Corinthians. This important word, however, is here altogether passed over; a circumstance the more significant, as our author is unusually careful in bringing out the sense of each word in his text. In those places which touch upon the doctrine of assurance, he appears to labour under a slight confusion of ideas. Thus, (page 21,) 'In ordinary religious experience, the testimony of the Spirit becomes the testimony of conscience;' and, again, (page 13,) 'The testimony of the conscience is consciousness.' This appears to confuse three things which are fundamentally distinct,—consciousness, the testimony of our conscience, and the testimony or witness of the Holy Spirit. Of course, we do not look for elaborate metaphysical disquisitions in a commentary; yet the interpreter of Scripture who so confounds things that are essentially different, is not fully equipped for his work. On the other hand, the work before us abounds with just observations, and is well adapted for general readers. The references to the original are not such as to render the sense obscure to those who do not read Greek. In this respect, the exposition of Dr. Hodge is equally useful with that of Albert Barnes; while it is more original, more critical, and more thorough. We should be glad to welcome an exposition of some or all of St. Paul's Epistles, equally good in other respects, written on the principles of Evangelical Arminianism,—or, as we should prefer to say, on the principles of the original faith of the Christian Church before the days of Augustine.

Aspirations from the Inner, the Spiritual Life, aiming to reconcile Religion, Literature, Science, and Art, with Faith and Hope and Love and Immortality. By Henry M'Cormac, M.D.—Those who are accustomed to estimate a book by a few sure outward signs will not be deceived in this pretentious volume. It may be read almost by finger and thumb, and is what it appears to be—a book of common-places dressed up in metaphysical and mystic jargon. The mind of Dr. M'Cormac seems quite at the mercy of any writer who has an infinite way of saying nothing, and a religious persuasion 'that nought is every-thing and everything is nought.' We must give a specimen or two of the author's style to bear out our description. Of the late Blanco

White we read: 'He stood on the rock of Providence, the inner light, the infinite rationality of the infinitely perfect God.' There are plenty of notes in the volume, but not one to tell us what that means. (The notes are in Greek, Latin, French, Spanish, German, and Italian, as being much more easy than the text which they elucidate.) Then we are presented with 'a golden thought.' 'The golden thought flashed this morning with peculiar vividness in my soul, that we were indeed members of the Divine commonwealth, part and parcel of the glorious congregation of God's creatures, worlds stretching beyond worlds into space illimitable, and that infinite intelligence, and love as infinite, took concern of us for ever. For the present and the future are as one great Now, and the soul's pulses of the moment are the same throughout eternity.' We should like to know how much wiser than before would the reader be for a wilderness of thoughts like these? Yet this dreary book is full of them. The author is never tired of calling things 'Divine.' We have the Divine Environment, the Divine Want, the Divine Initiation, the Divine Everywhere; and a thousand equally intelligible uses of the term. As to the 'inner or spiritual life,' promised on the title-page, there is no allusion to anything worthy of the name. The book is full of a weak pantheism and eclecticism, borrowed wholesale from Jews, infidels, and heretics; and if any person should be so young or so foolish as to read it with admiring pleasure, it will deepen the confusion of his intellects and diminish the chances of his sanity. It were easier—and better—for a man to fill his belly with the east wind than his understanding with such a fog.

A View of the Evidences of Christianity. In Three Parts. By William Paley, M.A., Archdeacon of Carlisle. With Annotations by Richard Whately, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. Parker and Son, 1859.—It is hardly necessary to do more than introduce this volume to the reader's notice. Dr. Whately is known to be an editor of the highest merit, the talent of elucidation being that for which he is most remarkable. We are glad he has chosen the writings of Paley for the exercise of this faculty. Both author and editor have much in common, so far as intellectual character and tastes extend; both also are eminent apologists of Christianity; and it is pleasant to find them uniting the strength of their clear and forcible reasoning in the same important defence. The work is prepared by an Introduction in which Dr. Whately exposes the folly and weakness of those who deprecate all inquiry into the evidences of our religion.

Discourses. By the Rev. William Anderson, LL.D. Second Series. Glasgow.—It is sermons like these which may be printed with the greatest propriety and advantage. They are not mere hortatory addresses, better heard than read, but logical and vigorous compositions that charm the student with new and deeper views of Divine truth. The author's style is pure and nervous, and admirably sustains the current of his thoughts.

Sermons, preached chiefly on Public Occasions. By Thomas Jackson, A.M., Rector of Stoke Newington. Longman. 1859.—The sermons of this volume are more popular in character than those just noticed, but they are well worthy of publication and perusal. They testify to a faithful and able ministry, of which they will be to many an attractive and permanent memorial.

Alpha and Omega: or, A Series of Scripture Studies. By George Gilfillan, Minister of the Gospel, Dundee. In Two Volumes. London. 1860.—We are happy to congratulate Mr. Gilfillan upon a sensible improvement, both in the style and matter of his present work. When we last called him before our readers, it was our unpleasant duty to administer a gentle reproof, in the interests of good taste and sober judgment. Perhaps the advice then given has not had much to do with it,—advice has frequently, we fear, a contrary effect; for when is a man more inclined to lose his temper than when he is mildly desired to keep it?—but it is certain, that the present publication of Mr. Gilfillan is free from the gross blemishes which disfigure the Gallery of Literary Portraits. We are inclined to attribute much of this improvement to the fact, that the work before us has a serious and connected plan, and that most of it was prepared in the prosecution of regular ministerial duty. The scheme of the whole is ambitious enough; but the author grapples it in a professional and steady manner, and there is much virtue in systematic work and definite purpose. Hence the style of these discourses is comparatively good. The man who is going somewhere has a firmer step, a better carriage, than he who is only lounging for effect. Mr. Gilfillan loses no advantage which lies before him in the prosecution of his plan, which consists mainly in setting forth the bolder features of Old-Testament history and character. Many striking thoughts occur throughout these volumes, and much brilliant description alternates with much that is wild and overwrought. Sometimes the subject is a snare to his impetuous genius. The Angelic Revolt, the Creation, and the Flood, —Cain, and Enoch, and Abraham, and Joshua,—the burial of Moses, and the exploits of Samson; these are all treated in the author's pictorial manner—not in the severe style of Milton or Buonarrotti, but with a certain pseudo-grandeur which suggests the names of Martin and Danby. There are plenty of performances of a different and superior order; but it is only right to say that there is room also for this. If our young readers will not indulge too far their admiration of this author, and of other rhetorical favourites, they may have a dispensation for occasional reading; but young ministers are strictly excluded from this indulgence.

INDEX.

- Alum*, account of manufacture of, 54
Anderson's 'Discourses,' noticed, 555
'Annotated Paragraph Bible,' noticed, 542
Arabs of the Turkish Empire, account of, 89
Arctic explorations, 226—early navigators, 228—modern voyages of discovery, 232—Sir John Franklin, 235—wintering in Beechey Island, 240—unsuccessful search, 245—Dr. Rae's discovery of remains, 246—M'Clure's North-West Passage, 248—abandonment of the search, 251—Lady Franklin's final search, 253—winter in the ice-pack, 255—discovery of relics, 258
Asses, the feast of, account of the celebration of, 31
Athens, state of, under Pericles, 198
Austria, illustration of the military system of, 98
Baffin's discoveries in the Arctic Seas, 230
Bateman's 'Life of the Right Rev. Daniel Wilson, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Calcutta,' reviewed, 451
Bayly's 'Ragged Homes, and How to mend them,' reviewed, 416
Belloc, Lieutenant, account of his death, 250
Best's, Mrs., 'Abroad: and how to live there,' noticed, 269
Bible-women in London, gratifying results of their labours, 431
Bolton and *Whitby Abbey* rolls, curious statistics in the, 33
Books and their bindings, 167—bibliomania, 168—ancient book covers, 170—M. Libri on bookbinding, 172—bindings of the sixteenth century, 173—old German binding, 179—De Thou and Fouquet's libraries, 181—Colbert's, 183—Letellier's, 184—revolutionary destruction of bindings, 185
Bookbinders, famous, account of, 187
Brewing, mediæval restrictions on, 357
Brown's, Dr. J., 'Horse Subsecur,' noticed, 268
Brown's, John, 'North-West Passage and the Plans for the Search for Sir John Franklin,' reviewed, 226
Brown, John, in Kansas, anecdotes of, 333
Buchanan's 'Book of Ecclesiasties: its Meaning and its Lessons,' noticed, 263
Buxton's 'Slavery and Freedom in the British West Indies,' reviewed, 309
Carlyle's, Thomas, 'Life of Friedrich Schiller,' reviewed, 109
Chambers's, R., 'Domestic Annals of Scotland,' reviewed, 476
Chambers's, W., 'American Slavery and Colour,' reviewed, 309
Charlton's 'History of Whitby, and of Whitby Abbey,' reviewed, 25
Cobbold's 'Pictures of the Chinese,' noticed, 275
Cædmon, the Saxon poet, account of, 27
'Commentary on the Pentateuch,' by Gerlach, noticed, 542
Commerce, oppressive regulations of, in London in the thirteenth century, 358
Cureton's 'Remains of ancient Syriac Gospels, reviewed,' 60
Curtis's 'School and College History of England,' noticed, 268
Darwin on the Origin of Species, 281—the author's proposition, 284—natural selection, 286—domestic species and artificial breeding, 287—natural varieties, 288—struggle for existence, 290—the Creator's method of procedure, 303—instinct, 395—natural law and moral freedom, 306
D'Essayrac de Lature, le Comte, 'Des Etats Masulmans et de l'Orient en général,' reviewed, 85
Diana of Poitiers, curious account of, 177
'Domeaday of St. Paul's,' the, quoted, 345
Domestic annals of Scotland, 476—commerce and manufactures, 477—meat and drink, 478—family feuds, 480
Domestic architecture of London in the thirteenth century, 348
Dresser's 'Unity in Variety,' noticed, 552
Durrien's 'Present State of Morocco,' reviewed, 148
Eastern problems, 85—signs of change, 87—Arabs, 89—Jews, 90—Egyptians, 92—Greeks, 93—Turkish decay, 94—Ottoman venality, 95—influence of the Ulemas, 105—plans for allotment of the Turkish Empire, 196
Edward III., feasting at the Coronation of, 347
Eglintoun, Earl of, murder of, in 1585, 482

- Egyptians*, degenerate state of the, 92
Eskdale, scenery of, described, 57
Etheridge, Dr., his 'Syrian Churches' noticed, 84
Fishing adventure on the eastern coast, account of a, 46
Fitz-Stephen the chronicler, his curious description of London in the twelfth century, 337
Forbes's 'Memoirs of a Banking House,' noticed, 272
Fosbrooke's 'British Monachism,' reviewed, 25
Franklin Expedition, departure of the, 235—instructions, 237
Free and Slave labour, comparative cost of, in the United States, 314
Freedom and Slavery, statistics of, 320, *et seq.*
'French Chronicle of London,' quoted, 340, 355
Frobisher and Davis, early Arctic navigators, their explorations, 229
Geographical Society, Journal of the, quoted, 152
Geology, negative evidence of, 301
Giffillan's 'Alpha and Omega,' noticed, 556
Glasedale, primitive simplicity of inhabitants of, 53
Goethe and Schiller, lyrical poems of, 145
Gordon, General Patrick, 494—his voluminous Diary, 495—birth, 495—departs from home, 496—troubles and adventures, 497—enlists in a Swedish troop, 499—taken prisoner by the Poles, 500—enters their service, 501—in the Russian army, 502—journey to Moscow, 503—his mission to Charles II., 505—gap in the Diary, 506—second visit to England, 507—in the Crimea, 508—in favour with Peter the Great, 509—illness and death, 511
'Graduated Series of Lesson Books,' Book the Fourth, noticed, 267
Greeks, the, in Turkey, 92
Gregory's 'Mémorial of Emma Tatham,' noticed, 262
Grollier, Treasurer, description of his library, 175
'Hermann and Dorothea,' translated by Dale, noticed, 546
Herring fishing, process and statistics of, 46, *et seq.*
Hilda, the lady, first abbess of Streonshalh, account of, 25—her miracles, 27
'History of England,' by Lord Macaulay, its great success, 17—its general character, 19
'Histoire des Protestants et des Eglises Réformées du Poitou. Par Auguste Liéuze,' noticed, 544
Hodge's 'Exposition of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians,' noticed, 553
Hoole's, Dr., 'Ladies' Tamil Book,' noticed, 265
Instinct, exquisite adjustment of, 304
Jackson's Sermons, noticed, 555
Janissaries, the, and their successors, 97
Jet manufactures, account of, 55
Jews in Turkey, imputations on the, 90
Jews, persecution of the, in London in the Middle Ages, 354
Joan of Arc, Shakspeare's and Schiller's, contrasted, 135
Knox, John, curious anecdote of, 490
Kurtz's 'History of the Christian Church to the Reformation,' translated by Edersheim, noticed, 553
'Lays of Ancient Rome,' by Lord Macaulay, critique on, 15, *et seq.*
Laycock's, Dr., 'Mind and Brain: or, The Correlations of Consciousness and Organization,' reviewed, 433
Leatie, Robert, Recollections and Correspondence of, noticed, 540
'Liber Albus,' quoted, 352
'Liber de antiquis Legibus,' quoted, 347
Libri, M., on bookbinding and its development, 172
Limits of religious thought, 362—the Bampton Lectures, 363—Sir W. Hamilton's philosophy, 366—rationalism and reason, 375—Maurice on Mansel, 380—pantheism and theism, 390—Dr. Mansel's dilemma, 393—absoluteness of the Deity, 398—intuition of Christian consciousness, 402—speculative and regulative knowledge, 404—Mansel's concessions to infidelity, 413
London wall, the old, description of, 338
London in the thirteenth century, 336—the City gates, 339—West Chepe, 341—ancient markets, 342—the suburbs, 344—conventual establishments, 345—wages, 350—police, 351—tolls, 355—commercial statistics, 359
Macaulay, the Historian, Statesman, and Essayist, noticed, 3
Macaulay's, Lord, Biographies, 1—birth, 3—boyhood, 5—at Cambridge, 6—in Parliament, 7—as an orator, 8—his literary labours, 10, *et seq.*—the Essays, 11—'Lays of Ancient Rome,' 15—'History of England,' 17—extent and accuracy of his acquirements, 20—brilliance of his style, 22

- Mackay's*, Charles, 'Life and Liberty in America: or, Sketches of a Tour in the United States and Canada in 1857-8,' reviewed, 309
- Mansel's* 'Limits of Religious Thought examined,' reviewed, 362
- Maurice's* 'What is Revelation?' reviewed, 362
- McClintock's* 'Narrative of the Discovery of the Fate of Sir John Franklin and his Companions,' reviewed, 226
- McClure's* discovery of the North-West Passage, 248
- McCormac's* 'Aspirations from the Inner, or Spiritual, Life,' noticed, 554
- McCosh's* 'Method of Divine Government,' quoted, 401, *et seq.*
- Military systems*, French, 100—English, 101
- Mind and brain*, Dr. Laycock on, 433—the inductive method, 434—innate ideas, 437—teleology, 438—mind and matter, 441—Scottish philosophy, 442—moral and religious decline, 445—phrenology, 447
- '*Missing Link*': or, Bible Women in the Homes of the London Poor,' reviewed, 416
- Missouri Compromise*, history of the, 329
- Monks in the fourteenth century*, irregular lives of, 30—blasphemy in their ordinary discipline, 32
- More*, Mrs. Hannah, anecdotes of, 5, 6.
- Morocco*, 148—neglected by England, 149—description of the country, 150—fanaticism of the people, 153—varied population, 155—domestic life, 156—education and religion, 157—the Emperor's government, 158—decline of the country, 160—agriculture, 160—productions and trade, 161—principal towns, 162—probable fate of Morocco, 163—war with Spain, 165
- '*New Exegesis of Shakspeare*,' noticed, 264
- New York and Texas*, comparative wealth of, 312
- North-West Passage*, true discoverer of the, 243
- Osborne's* 'Career of Franklin,' reviewed, 226
- Oxford Essayists*, the, 512—childhood of the human race, 513—education of the world, 515—Bunsen's 'Bibel-Werk,' 516—redemption, 519—Bunsen's creed, 521—Bible chronology, 523—the Mosaic cosmogony, 525—Professor Jowett, 526—inspiration, 528—the ideal of the new exegesis, 535
- Paley's* 'View of the Evidences of Christianity,' edited by Whately, noticed, 555
- Pallaske's* 'Life and Writings of Frederick Schiller,' reviewed, 109
- Paper*, manufacture of, introduced into Scotland, 477
- Parry's* early discoveries in the Arctic regions, 232
- Pennant's* 'Tour in Scotland,' quoted, 479
- Pig-feeding* settlement at Notting Dale, description of, 421
- Plato's* 'Apology,' quoted, 202, 203
- Pliny*, quoted, 152
- '*Prophet of Nazareth*,' noticed, 543
- Ragged* homes and ministering women, 416—New Testament examples, 417—woman a helper, 418—Notting Dale pigery, 421—cholera and fever, 422—recklessness of the inhabitants of the Potteries of Notting Dale, 423—intemperance and the pawn-shop, 425—disappointment turned to good account, 426—tact and skill required, 428—sympathy rewarded, 430
- Richardson's* 'Travels in Morocco,' reviewed, 148
- Richter*, Jean Paul, his interview with Schiller, 111
- Ross's*, Rev. W., 'Papers on Teaching, and on kindred Subjects,' noticed, 267
- Ross's*, O. C. D., 'Spain and the War with Morocco,' reviewed, 148
- Royal Academy of Arts*, exhibition of the, noticed, 537
- Sargent's* 'Compendium of Biblical Criticism on the Canonical Scripture,' noticed, 450
- Schiller*, Friedrich, 109—his wide and ardent sympathies, 110—early struggle and privation, 113—friendship with Goethe, 115—'The Robbers,' 116—character of Karl Moor, 118—'Don Carlos,' 121—its beauties and defects, 123—'Wallenstein,' 125—'Mary Stuart,' 130—'The Maid of Orleans,' 135—'The Bride of Messina,' 141—'William Tell,' 142—Schiller's peaceful end, 146—concluding observations, 147
- Scotland*, absurd restrictions on commerce in, in the seventeenth century, 478—ecclesiastical discipline in, 484
- Slave* politics and economics, 309—Free and Slave States compared, 311—Eastern and Western Texas, 317—free-grown cotton, 319—statistics, 320—West Indies, 323—slavery at the Revolution, 327—party struggles, 330—

- John Brown at Harper's Ferry, 334—the future, 335
- Sledging* expeditions, interesting account of, 257
- Smetham's* 'Etchings, from the Sketch-Book of an Artist,' noticed, 539
- Smithfield* in the thirteenth century, curious account of, 343
- Socrates*, 190—modern version of Plato, 190—his youthful discipline, 193—personal appearance, 195—courage, 196—opposition to the Sophists, 200—conviction of a Divine mission, 203—Divine illumination, 205—Plato and Xenophon, 206—inductive method, 207—his service to science, 209—value of his dialectic, 211—ethical teaching, 212—political and religious views, 215—ground of opposition to him, 218—trial and defence, 220—sentence, 221—death, 223—relations to Christianity, 225
- Sophists*, the, 199
- Staithe*, town of, described, 56
- Stevens's* 'History of the Religious Movement of the Eighteenth Century called Methodism,' noticed, 279
- '*St. Mary's* Church, Whitby,' quoted, 38
- St. Paul's*, curious account of, 344
- Stow*, John, quoted, 339, 342, 354
- Syriac* Gospels, ancient, 60—Dr. Cureton's researches, 61—the Nitrian manuscript, 63—its antiquity, 65—theory of an archetypal Gospel, 69—St. Matthew's Greek Gospel, 71—looseness of the Nitrian versions, 73—relative position of the Syriac texts, 74—specimens of readings from St. Matthew, 76—readings from the other Gospels, 79—the Syriac text and English translation, 81—the Aramaic and its literature, 82
- Taxes*, enormous amount of ancient city, 352
- Taylor's* 'Ultimate Civilization and other Essays,' noticed, 263
- Texas* and Iowa, comparison between, 311
- Thoman's* 'Theory of Compound Interest and Annuities,' noticed, 267
- Transcendentalism*, German and English school of, 386
- Tupper's* 'Three Hundred Sonnets,' noticed, 540
- Ventilation*, lesson on, 423
- Virginia*, progress of, compared with Free States, 312
- Voyages*, earlier northern, account of, 227
- Watson*, Richard, quoted, 378, 379
- '*Ways of the Line*: a Monograph on Excavators,' reviewed, 416
- Wellington* Channel, cruise up the, 239
- West* Chepe and Old Fish Street, description of, 341
- West* Indies under slavery, 323—under freedom, 325
- Whewell's* 'Platonic Dialogues for English Readers,' reviewed, 190
- Whitby*, 25—origin of the abbey, 25—its great revenues, 26—the poet Codmon, 27—destruction and restoration of the abbey, 28—its income, 29—privileges and power of the monks, 30—cloister life, 31—curious statistics, 33, 34—the abbey church, 35—present appearance of the town, 37—St. Mary's church, 37—the surrounding country, 39—the landscape from the bay, 41—dangers of the coast, 42—the harbour, 43—great increase of shipping, 44—the herring fishery, 45—fish-buyers, 53—jet manufacture, 55
- Wightman's* 'Haste to the Rescue: or, Work while it is Day,' reviewed, 416
- Wilson*, Bishop of Calcutta, memoirs of, 451—the biographer and his qualifications, 453—Wilson's early life, 454—his religious convictions, 455—at Oxford, 457—views of preaching, 458—zeal and efficiency, 461—at Worton, 462—St. John's, Bedford Row, 463—peculiarities, 464—great labours, 466—success as a preacher, 467—published works, 469—at Islington, 470—in India, 471—value of his journals, 473—great generosity, 475
- Witches* and warlocks, persecution of, in Scotland, 487
- Wittitlerly's* 'Three Months' Rest at Pan,' noticed, 280
- Young's* 'History of Whitby, and of Streoneshalh Abbey,' reviewed, 25—translation of Codmon's 'Book of Genesis,' quoted, 27, *note*
- Young's* 'Province of Reason,' quoted, 399

